THE CONCEPT OF *DEVA*

I

IN THE VEDIC AGE

THE CONCEPT OF *DEVA*

I

IN THE VEDIC AGE OF THE INDIAN LITERATURE

BY

C. W. J. VAN DER LINDEN SVD. MA. Ph.D.
PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF SAN CARLOS, CEBU,
PHILLIPINE ISLANDS

DRUKKERIJ „VESTA" — UTRECHT

THE CONCEPT OF *DEVA*

I

IN THE VEDIC AGE OF THE INDIAN LITERATURE

BY

C. W. J. VAN DER LINDEN SVD, MA. Ph.D.
PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL STUDIES AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF SAN CARLOS, CEBU,
PHILLIPINE ISLANDS

DRUKKERIJ „VESTA" — UTRECHT

Aan Mère Maria Richaria van der Linden Jmm.
die haar leven en liefde en gezondheid gaf voor
India en zijn Volk.

Aan Mère Maria Richaria van der Linden fmm.
die haar leven en liefde en gezondheid gaf voor
India en zijn Volk.

CONTENTS

pag.

PREFACE 9

INTRODUCTION 11

EXAMINATION of the Rig Veda 14

Conclusions 48

EXAMINATION of the Atharvaveda 51

Conclusions 70

Opinions of the authors 72

EXAMINATION of the Brāhmaṇas 75

Conclusions 94

Opinions of the authors 96

EXAMINATION of the Upaniṣads 99

Opinions of the authors 113

FINAL CONCLUSIONS 116

NOTES 124

BIBLIOGRAPHY 129

PREFACE

During my stay in India as a missonary, I met with one problem almost every day. People of the middle-sized town of Ratlām in the Madhya Bharat Province did see in my person "bring a missionary" nothing less than the "man of God". As Ratlām happened to be a very important bazaar — shopping centre —, all sorts of Indians and aboriginal classes were living there. In addition to that I was at the time chaplain of the B.B.C.I. Railway personnel and in those days I had still a free (travelling) pass at my disposal to make my travels easier for the cura animarum among my parishioners. So I had a truly *marvellous* opportunity of meeting all kind of people. As my "predecessors" had been always very hospitable to every one, people came to the presbytery just for a chat or so, and my parishioners brought their old or newly-made acquaintances along.

In this way I met with lots of people who were always disposed to talk about religion. I met well educated people, even graduates of several English Universities; I met "the man of the street" from Kūlmi Brahmins to the lowest class chowkidār of the railways. And in my talks and chats one point struck me very much "the mental difference" those people made in their conversation talking about gods. The well-educated Hindu did not care a hood for any *deva* or *devatā*. They could tell the most smelling yarns about them, and one felt a sort of contempt of the "gods".

The Bhils and the like I came across couldn't even care less. I should not like to relate the nasty remarks they uttered in passing by places of Hindu worship; even less the *dirty tricks* they played on some idols. They called every [illegible]
pagals = idiots. But — [illegible]
not like to talk about [illegible]
narrations about the De[illegible] they explained the "holy pictures" they were carrying about, or had *pasted near* their dashboards. And I may say: one could discover a certain fright about the devas and a certain disdain sometimes. They worshipped them one way or the other, they were afraid of those "*gods*", *but still* there was a kind of funny way of expressing that made me laugh. Still, talking on religion and *God* they had some good ideas that could compete with even Christian concepts. The deep reverence and heigh esteem shown in their words was really edifying. So I was faced with a problem of

PREFACE

During my stay in India as a missonary, I met with one problem almost every day. People of the middle-sized town of Ratlām in the Madhya Bharat Province did see in my person "bring a missionary" nothing less than the "man of God". As Ratlām happened to be a very important bazaar — shopping centre —, all sorts of Indians and aboriginal classes were living there. In addition to that I was at the time chaplain of the B.B.C.I. Railway personnel and in those days I had still a free (travelling) pass at my disposal to make my travels easier for the cura animarum among my parishioners. So I had a truly marvellous opportunity of meeting all kind of people. As my "predecessors" had been always very hospitable to every one, people came to the presbytery just for a chat or so, and my parishioners brought their old or newly-made acquaintances along.

In this way I met with lots of people who were always disposed to talk about religion. I met well educated people, even graduates of several English Universities; I met "the man of the street" from Kūlmī Brahmins to the lowest class chowkidār of the railways. And in my talks and chats one point struck me very much "the mental difference" those people made in their conversation talking about gods. The well-educated Hindu did not care a hood for any deva or devatā. They could tell the most smelling yarns about them, and one felt a sort of contempt of the "gods".

The Bhils and the like I came across couldn't even care less. I should not like to relate the nasty remarks they uttered in passing by places of Hindu worship; even less the dirty tricks they played on some idols. They called every [illegible] *pagals* = idiots. But — [illegible] not like to talk about [illegible] narrations about the Devas. They explained the "holy pictures" they were carrying about, or had pasted near their dashboards. And I may say: one could discover a certain fright about the devas and a certain disdain sometimes. They worshipped them one way or the other, they were afraid of those "gods", but still there was a kind of funny way of expressing that made me laugh. Still, talking on religion and God they had some good ideas that could compete with even Christian concepts. The deep reverence and heigh esteem shown in their words was really edifying. So I was faced with a problem of

every day-life = the feelings towards their devas — much worshipped and their high respect towards the One, they could not name.

These facts induced me to write on this subject. The research I made on Vedic literature I conclude in this work. But still I am longing to go on with my research, disclosing the innermost thoughts available to me in literature and by doing some ethnological research in the fields after some time as well.

Suggestions I should like to receive and I'll be only too grateful to make use of them.

May I thank Prof. Gonda — my professor in Sanskrit — at Utrecht's University for his valuable help. May I also thank Mrs. Jean v. d. Werve-Attwood for looking through the proofs and paying special regard to my English.

C. VAN DER LINDEN SVD.

Utrecht, November 19th, 1954.

My research into the concept of *deva* was caused primarily by the simple fact that no very wide investigation of this subject has as yet been undertaken, however great the bearing such an investigation might have on the science of Indian religions in particular and the history of Religion in general. India has often been left completely out of the general history of Religion, since it is not possible to regard the culture and religions of India as belonging to the more primitive stages of religious thought. As if primitive modes of thought were the only important element in ethnological problems, and as if the Indian mind has developed itself to its high degree completely harmonically, so that it might be thought that primitive traits once present were now forever hidden! Prof. Gonda says in "Het Boeddhisme" [1]): "Een der meest karakteristieke kenmerken van de Indische cultuur is, dat deze zich tot op grote hoogte ontwikkeld heeft op een primitieve grondslag met behoud van zeer vele primitieve elementen." My own experience in India has been the strongest confirmation of this opinion. It was a daily experience that highly-developed cultural elements were mixed through and through with primitive remains.

It is generally believed and accepted that *deva* means god i.e. God; but practically no author undertook any kind of research into this matter nor did they inquire whether:

1) *deva* could have been identical with our idea of God;

2) *deva* is the concept of God in the Indian mind;

3) *deva* has been used everywhere in the same meaning.

And here we reach the border of a very difficult terrain, where we shall have to take our *positions*, not entirely unmoved by our own view of life. Is it reasonable to detect a certain type of concept of the deity as a Supreme Being, or is a concept or "spirit" or "ghost" in the usual sense or something similar given the name of God?

Furthermore: it is [illegible] Supreme I[illegible] of scienti[illegible] [illegible] of the existence of a personal Deity on whatever sound reasons, would be prejudicial to a scientific standpoint?

every day-life = the feelings towards their devas — much worshipped and their high respect towards the One, they could not name.

These facts induced me to write on this subject. The research I made on Vedic literature I conclude in this work. But still I am longing to go on with my research, disclosing the innermost thoughts available to me in literature and by doing some ethnological research in the fields after some time as well.

Suggestions I should like to receive and I'll be only too grateful to make use of them.

May I thank Prof. Gonda — my professor in Sanskrit — at Utrecht's University for his valuable help. May I also thank Mrs. Jean v. d. Werve-Attwood for looking through the proofs and paying special regard to my English.

C. VAN DER LINDEN SVD.

Utrecht, November 19th, 1954.

INTRODUCTION

My research into the concept of *deva* was caused primarily by the simple fact that no very wide investigation of this subject has as yet been undertaken, however great the bearing such an investigation might have on the science of Indian religions in particular and the history of Religion in general. India has often been left completely out of the general history of Religion, since it is not possible to regard the culture and religions of India as belonging to the more primitive stages of religious thought. As if primitive modes of thought were the only important element in ethnological problems, and as if the Indian mind has developed itself to its high degree completely harmonically, so that it might be thought that primitive traits once present were now forever hidden! Prof. Gonda says in "Het Boeddhisme" [1]): "Een der meest karakteristieke kenmerken van de Indische cultuur is, dat deze zich tot op grote hoogte ontwikkeld heeft op een primitieve grondslag met behoud van zeer vele primitieve elementen." My own experience in India has been the strongest confirmation of this opinion. It was a daily experience that highly-developed cultural elements were mixed through and through with primitive remains.

It is generally believed and accepted that *deva* means god i.e. God; but practically no author undertook any kind of research into this matter nor did they inquire whether:

1) *deva* could have been identical with our idea of God;

2) *deva* is the concept of God in the Indian mind;

3) *deva* has been used everywhere in the same meaning.

And here we reach the border of a very difficult terrain, where we shall have to take our positions, not entirely unmoved by our own view of life. Is it reasonable to detect a certain type of concept of the deity as a Supreme Being, or is a concept or "spirit" or "ghost" in the usual sense or something similar given the name of God?

Furthermore: is it scientifically allowed to accept any idea of a Supreme Being, or will that be against common sense and the standing of scientific man, so that even the acceptance of the existence of a personal Deity on whatever sound reasons, would be prejudicial to a scientific standpoint?

every day-life = the feelings towards their devas — much worshipped and their high respect towards the One, they could not name.

These facts induced me to write on this subject. The research I made on Vedic literature I conclude in this work. But still I am longing to go on with my research, disclosing the innermost thoughts available to me in literature and by doing some ethnological research in the fields after some time as well.

Suggestions I should like to receive and I'll be only too grateful to make use of them.

May I thank Prof. Gonda — my professor in Sanskrit — at Utrecht's University for his valuable help. May I also thank Mrs. Jean v. d. Werve-Attwood for looking through the proofs and paying special regard to my English.

C. VAN DER LINDEN SVD.

Utrecht, November 19th, 1954.

So my method of research will be: to investigate what the term *deva* may contain *hic et nunc* in the texts under consideration.

But I should like to make one more preliminary remark: not every request for assistance and rescue should be considered as a proof that the Vedic Indian detected something clearly divine in those *devas*, neither any prayer for help, wealth, health or progeny. Very often the *deva*-being consists of supranormality seen from our own point of view as humans. Something which no one is able to perform in common circumstances, is now performed by a *deva*. This *deva* is someone he respects and is afraid of. Someone that is able to help him and who has unusual powers. The Vedic Indian does not see the borderline between natural and supernatural as we do; we rather call it supranormal.

But as soon as a hymn implores purity of heart, love to the Supreme Being, forgiveness of sin, one may feel justified, I think, in considering it as an equivalent to our "supranatural" idea in the strict sense: The sense we take it.

I do not overlook the fact that my sources contained none of the thoughts of the commoner, but only those of one sort of people. We do know the family names of the writers of those hymns or theories, and in short we may safely state that the sources to be hereafter examined reflect the ideas of certain circles, let us say, of priestly society. Thus, we are on safe ground if we *consider the Vedas as an* endeavour of the "scholars" to formulate *their* own notions in sharper outline concerning the *devas* whom their own "common" people believed to exist.

In Sanskrit quotations some special letters which were not available in the printing-office are replaced by ordinary characters.

Another problem: may we start where some one else finished on this subject, or are we expected to begin all over again from the written sources in order to draw our conclusions?

Taking into consideration the viewpoint of many a scholar, I for *one should like to start in the following way:* to control and check the texts, as if asking: to what interpretation of the word *deva* am I compelled if I want a precise rendering of the passage in question?

We can leave out of our inquiry the etymology of the term *deva* and taking into account the semantic peculiarities of Eastern languages, *deva* must sometimes be rendered by "hero" or "king" or someone much fêted. The more so as the *Vedas* e.g. do not give us a true definition or description of the quintessence of the present term anywhere. The contents of the *Vedas* are mostly a compilation of hymns to pay homage to these beings. So Oldenberg: "Da wollen sie nicht von dem Gott, den sie feiern, erzählen, sondern sie wollen diesen Gott loben. Sie haben es nicht mit menschlichen Hörern zu tun; ihr Hörer ist der Gott selbst, den sie zur gnädigen Annahme des Opfers einladen"[2]. *I should like to describe this homage as praise and* laudation, to ask for assistance, to ask for rescue, and to secure the *deva's* powers as well, *moreover to increase the strength of the devas.*

Before starting the actual research I should like to observe, that also the Indian is a human being, gifted with common sense, even *the primitive native of Indian soil. Studying some ethnological works* one is compelled to believe, sometimes at least, that those primitive people have *everything in common with the animals, "those savages"* and that they — in some strange way — only derive the title "human *being" from us. I for one feel urged to protest against these inhuman* ideas of the old evolutionistic school, like Vroklage[3]): where he quotes Söderblom: "De geloofsboden hebben gelijk gekregen, doch niet geheel en al. Zo gaat het nu eenmaal in deze wereld. Steeds hebben de geloofsverkondigers van een hoge Godheid der natuurvolken bericht maar de (atheïstische, evolutionistische) wetenschap meende het beter te moeten weten. Iets verhevens kon bij "wilden" niet bestaan, want de ontwikkeling der cultuur moest van het lagere naar het hogere verlopen". So also think the other scholars of the Vienna School.

Primitive man, and moreover the Indian — may it be the aboriginal — is quite able to build up sound ideas about a Supreme Being in accord with the principle of causality. *The historical fact whether he* actually did build up his concepts about God, is another problem, not to be solved here. Primitiveness may be absence of *scientifically sustainable* concepts that are clear and "dogmatic", but the ideas of the primitive are no less based upon sound common sense and *sober reason.*

So my method of research will be: to investigate what the term *deva* may contain *hic et nunc* in the texts under consideration.

But I should like to make one more preliminary remark: not every request for assistance and rescue should be considered as a proof that the Vedic Indian detected something clearly divine in those *devas*, neither any prayer for help, wealth, health or progeny. Very often the *deva*-being consists of supranormality seen from our own point of view as humans. Something which no one is able to perform in common circumstances, is now performed by a *deva*. This *deva* is someone he respects and is afraid of. Someone that is able to help him and who has unusual powers. The Vedic Indian does not see the borderline between natural and supernatural as we do; we rather call it supranormal.

But as soon as a hymn implores purity of heart, love to the Supreme Being, forgiveness of sin, one may feel justified, I think, in considering it as an equivalent to our "supranatural" idea in the strict sense: The sense we take it.

I do not overlook the fact that my sources contained none of the thoughts of the commoner, but only those of one sort of people. We do know the family names of the writers of those hymns or theories, and in short we may safely state that the sources to be hereafter examined reflect the ideas of certain circles, let us say, of priestly society. Thus, we are on safe ground if we consider the *Vedas* as an endeavour of the "scholars" to formulate *their* own notions in sharper outline concerning the *devas* whom their own "common" people believed to exist.

In Sanskrit quotations some special letters which were not available in the printing-office are replaced by ordinary characters.

EXAMINATION OF THE RIG VEDA

While examining the passages*) of the RV. where we acquired the term *deva*, it first of all struck me that so many citations gave no insight into the true meaning of the word *deva*. As a title it is used together with functions or professions, that according to our ideas do not show any divine trait; they even suggest a mere human being or something that could be said of a spirit; so RV. 1,1,5: and elsewhere where Agni is praised as being a priest. Moreover, *deva* is often used as a title and sometimes as vocative without any adjective; so a correct rendering would not translate *deva* because neither context nor the term for itself show the real content... e.g. 1,23,8: 24,3: 27,4: 35,1: 36,4: *Devas* lighten the sacrificial fire 1,36,10: 40,6: 43,5: 50,1: 8: 10: 71,5: 91,14: 94,8: 136,4: 184,3: *śriye pūṣann iṣukṛteva devā nāsatyā vahatuṃ sūryāyāḥ / vacyante vāṃ kakuhā apsu jātā yugā jūrṇeva varuṇasya bhūreḥ*: Geldner translates: "Die Götter Nāsatyas (kamen) auf die Hochzeit der Sūryā um ausgezeichnet zu werden als Pfeilschmiede, o Pūṣan. Es hüpfen (1st ed.) or schweben (2nd ed.) eure Buckeltiere auf dem Wasser, die Wassergeborenen. Abgenützt sind die Joche wie die des reichen Varuṇas."

Nothing forces Geldner in this text to render *deva* by "Götter". It is no more than a stereotype rendering.

At times Geldner translates *deva* by "divine" (göttlich) quite according to what we just mentioned, e.g. 2,3,4: where we hear the Barhisgrass, used at the sacrifices, called as "*deva*". Here follows a list of passages with the contents summed up above: 2,1,4: 11: 3,4: 4,1: 22,1: 28,3: 30,1: 31,4: [1]).

Some passages might suggest something higher than just a title and especially the context makes it credible, that one has to accept more exalted and august concept than only the word *deva*. I believe the Indian himself from his point of view will have considered it that way. But below we shall say more about this topic.

2. In connexion with *deva* we meet titles such as *purohita, hotṛ, dūta, havyavāha* ("Opferfahrer") and *yajiṣṭha* ("bester Opferer") especially attributed to Agni.

*) The quotation of passages does not always contain the same term as that mentioned, but either a synonym or the same thought has been expressed in the entire passage or part thereof.

From the passages we clearly discern that *purohita* and *hotṛ* are priestly functions conferred on Agni by the *devas* [2]) or sometimes by the mortals [3]), sometimes by both: RV. 6,15,8:. Somewhere else he offers: RV. 1,76,5: 3,9,8: 6,16,3: 10:.

We meet Agni being called *dūta* which has about the same meaning as "messenger" of the sacrifices cf. 7,3,1: 6,16,43: 44: and again, being sent by human beings to invite the *devas* to the offering. Although in several passages we hear Agni praised as *hotṛ* and *purohita* — his most exalted title — implicitly we learn from it that even the *devas* need a priestly figure: RV. 3,9,9:.

RV. 6,16,48: shows us Agni as the sacrificial fire and so as a messenger, who invites the *devas* or who is sometimes used by the *devas* for their offerings.

7,3,1: we hear Agni mentioned as the "best Priest" and 6,15,8: we hear him called *havyavāha* "Opferfahrer" (thus Geldner renders). We may infer that here Agni is seen as the power inherent in the sacrificial fire as we said above, cf. 3,11,7: 17,4: 29,7:.

3. Agni has the duty of *purohita* and *hotṛ*, because the *devas* themselves appointed him, cf. 1,31,11: 2,4,3: 6,16,1:. This last passage shows him too as the governor of heaven and earth.

The Indians see him as a mediator. Mediator between humans and higher beings cf. 2,4,3; as well as for the *devas* in order to relate themselves to something higher, which, however, is only hinted at in 6,16,1:.

One may notice that Agni is called a *deva* among the *devas*. At times it struck me by the context only, that he shares this title as a special gift. Again we get the impression that Agni is essentially a *deva*, now and then even, that he is *the deva* amongst the group of *devas*. What we want to stress, is however, that Agni being honoured as *deva* receives at the same time titles as *purohita*, *havyavāha*, *hotṛ* and *dūta*. In this connection I cannot state that the Vedic Indian was clearly discriminating between mediator between gods and men and mediator only between human beings — or again as a priest between man and *devas*, or between the *devas* and something higher. At times however, I could not help receiving the impression that even a sort of magical view on sacrifice and its functionary was playing a part. It does not appear too clearly. Pure magic does not show itself too often in RV. The *hotṛ* or *purohita* still works by his own power or sets other forces into motion that profit the *devas*, that prosper the *devas* and bring them to higher development. (The texts mostly use the term *vṛdh* in this connexion).

4. Another characteristic of *deva* is found here: *ṛtvij*, that hints at

EXAMINATION OF THE RIG VEDA

While examining the passages *) of the RV. where we acquired the term *deva*, it first of all struck me that so many citations gave no insight into the true meaning of the word *deva*. As a title it is used together with functions or professions, that according to our ideas do not show any divine trait; they even suggest a mere human being or something that could be said of a spirit; so RV. 1,1,5: and elsewhere where Agni is praised as being a priest. Moreover, *deva* is often used as a title and sometimes as vocative without any adjective; so a correct rendering would not translate *deva* because neither context nor the term for itself show the real content ... e.g. 1,23,8: 24,3: 27,4: 35,1: 36,4: *Devas* lighten the sacrificial fire 1,36,10: 40,6: 43,5: 50,1: 8: 10: 71,5: 91,14: 94,8: 136,4: 184,3: *śriye pūṣann iṣukṛteva devā nāsatyā vahatuṃ sūryāyāḥ / vacyante vāṃ kakuhā apsu jātā yugā jūrṇeva varuṇasya bhūreḥ:* Geldner translates: "Die Götter Nāsatyas (kamen) auf die Hochzeit der Sūryā um ausgezeichnet zu werden als Pfeilschmiede, o Pūṣan. Es hüpfen (1st ed.) or schweben (2nd ed.) eure Buckeltiere auf dem Wasser, die Wassergeborenen. Abgenützt sind die Joche wie die des reichen Varuṇas."

Nothing forces Geldner in this text to render *deva* by "Götter". It is no more than a stereotype rendering.

At times Geldner translates *deva* by "divine" (göttlich) quite according to what we just mentioned, e.g. 2,3,4: where we hear the Barhisgrass, used at the sacrifices, called as "*deva*". Here follows a list of passages *with the contents summed up above: 2,1,4: 11:* 3,4: 4,1: 22,1: 28,3: 30,1: 31,4:[1]).

Some passages might suggest something higher than just a title and especially the context makes it credible, *that one has to accept more* exalted and august concept than only the word *deva*. I believe the Indian himself from his point of view will have considered it that way. But below *we shall say more about this topic.*

2. In connexion with *deva* we meet titles such as *purohita, hotṛ, dūta, havyavāha* ("Opferfahrer") and *yajiṣṭha* ("bester Opferer") especially attributed to Agni.

*) *The quotation of passages does not always contain the same term as that mentioned, but either a synonym or the same thought has been expressed in the entire passage or part thereof.*

From the passages we clearly discern that *purohita* and *hotṛ* are priestly functions conferred on Agni by the *devas* [2]) or sometimes by the mortals [3]), sometimes by both: RV. 6,15,8:. Somewhere else he offers: RV. 1,76,5: 3,9,8: 6,16,3: 10:.

We meet Agni being called *dūta* which has about the same meaning as "messenger" of the sacrifices cf. 7,3,1: 6,16,43: 44: and again, being sent by human beings to invite the *devas* to the offering. Although in several passages we hear Agni praised as *hotṛ* and *purohita* — his most exalted title — implicitly we learn from it that even the *devas* need a priestly figure: RV. 3,9,9:.

RV. 6,16,48: shows us Agni as the sacrificial fire and so as a messenger, who invites the *devas* or who is sometimes used by the *devas* for their offerings.

7,3,1: we hear Agni mentioned as the "best Priest" and 6,15,8: we hear him called *havyavāha* "Opferfahrer" (thus Geldner renders). We may infer that here Agni is seen as the power inherent in the sacrificial fire as we said above, cf. 3,11,7: 17,4: 29,7:.

3. Agni has the duty of *purohita* and *hotṛ*, because the *devas* themselves appointed him, cf. 1,31,11: 2,4,3: 6,16,1:. This last passage shows him too as the governor of heaven and earth.

The Indians see him as a mediator. Mediator between humans and higher beings cf. 2,4,3; as well as for the *devas* in order to relate themselves to something higher, which, however, is only hinted at in 6,16,1:.

One may notice that Agni is called a *deva* among the *devas*. At times it struck me by the context only, that he shares this title as a special gift. Again we get the impression that Agni is essentially a *deva*, now and then even, that he is *the deva* amongst the group of *devas*. What we want to stress, is however, that Agni being honoured as *deva* receives at the same time titles as *purohita*, *havyavāha*, *hotṛ* and *dūta*. In this connection I cannot state that the Vedic Indian was clearly discriminating between mediator between gods and men and mediator only between human beings — or again as a priest between man and *devas*, or between the *devas* and something higher. At times however, I could not help receiving the impression that even a sort of magical view on sacrifice and its functionary was playing a part. It does not appear too clearly. Pure magic does not show itself too often in RV. The *hotṛ* or *purohita* still works by his own power or sets other forces into motion that profit the *devas*, that prosper the *devas* and bring them to higher development. (The texts mostly use the term *ṛdh* in this connexion).

4. Another characteristic of *deva* is found here: *ṛtvij*, that hints at

While examining the passages*) of the RV. where we acquired the term *deva*, it first of all struck me that so many citations gave no insight into the true meaning of the word *deva*. As a title it is used together with functions or professions, that according to our ideas do not show any divine trait; they even suggest a mere human being or something that could be said of a spirit; so RV. 1,1,5: and elsewhere where Agni is praised as being a priest. Moreover, *deva* is often used as a title and sometimes as vocative without any adjective; so a correct rendering would not translate *deva* because neither context nor the term for itself show the real content... e.g. 1,23,8: 24,3: 27,4: 35,1: 36,4: *Devas* lighten the sacrificial fire 1,36,10: 40,6: 43,5: 50,1: 8: 10: 71,5: 91,14: 94,8: 136,4: 184,3: *śriye pūṣann iṣukṛteva devā nāsatyā vahatuṃ sūryāyāḥ / vacyante vāṃ kakuhā apsu jātā yugā jūrṇeva varuṇasya bhūreḥ:* Geldner translates: "Die Götter Nāsatyas (kamen) auf die Hochzeit der Sūryā um ausgezeichnet zu werden als Pfeilschmiede, o Pūṣan. Es hüpfen (1st ed.) or schweben (2nd ed.) eure Buckeltiere auf dem Wasser, die Wassergeborenen. Abgenützt sind die Joche wie die des reichen Varuṇas."

Nothing forces Geldner in this text to render *deva* by "Götter". It *is no more than a stereotype rendering.*

At times Geldner translates *deva* by "divine" (göttlich) quite according to what we just mentioned, e.g. 2,3,4: where we hear the Barhisgrass, used at the sacrifices, called as "*deva*". Here follows a list of passages with the contents summed up above: 2,1,4: 11: 3,4: 4,1: 22,1: 28,3: 30,1: 31,4: [1]).

Some passages might suggest something higher than just a title and *especially the context makes it credible, that one has to accept more* exalted and august concept than only the word *deva*. I believe the Indian himself from his point of view will have considered it that way. But below we shall say more about this topic.

2. In connexion with *deva* we meet titles such as *purohita*, *hotṛ*, *dūta*, *havyavāha* ("Opferfahrer") and *yajiṣṭha* ("bester Opferer") especially attributed to Agni.

*) The quotation of passages does not always contain the same term as that mentioned, but either a synonym or the same thought has been expressed in the entire passage or part thereof.

Veda nur "Wahrheit" bedeutet" (o.c. p. 14). "Ihre" have to be seen as the ancient Indian theologians. The Indian saw "Truth" as the great power behind everything spiritual as well as the physical world; (cf. Lüders, o.c. p. 15) and the author concludes: "Dem arischen Inder galt also die Wahrheit als die höchste Macht, als die letzte Ursache alles Seins" (cf. p. 24). In my opinion *ṛta* and later *Brahman* may be considered as God in sensu stricto; however, we do not leave out Lüder's note: "Man hat das *ṛta* in Indien niemals personifiziert; kultische Verehrung hat es nicht genossen." With this *ṛta* the *devas* have close relations: *ṛtasya yonim āsadam* 3,62,13: and Lüders, o.c., p. 25 observes that *ṛtasya sadas* will be later on rendered by *satyaloka* — that is the highest possible heavenly space. When Lüders looks closely into the true contents of this *yonir ṛtasya*, we learn that they are the heavenly waters. Water, over which one makes a contract or takes an oath. This is the very reason why an oath and contract are valid and unrescindable, and also why a broken word is considered as a capital sin. *ṛtasya yoniḥ* is "*udaka*" "water" according to the older theologians (Lüders, o.c. p. 26): "Niemals ist dort der Schosz des *ṛta* etwas anderes als jene Wasserflut im höchsten Himmel am Nabel der Welt."

Tad yat tat satyam asau sa ādityaḥ BAU. 5,5,2: and S. Br. 6,7,1,2: relate to us that *yat satyam*, with *asau sa ādityaḥ*. In this connexion we may point to the work of Prof. Dr. B. A. G. Vroklage [4]), much too early departed from us, in which he ascertains that the sky, sun in the sky, stands for God in sensu stricto, in the old myths and fables. It is even so in every bit of thinking of primitive man. So Prof. [illegible]

[illegible] the very same. The Indians motive for cultus, for sacrifice and rites was always, the deadly fright they had of the tremendous power of the *devās* and *devatās*. Yet, I encountered too a somewhat reasonable and sensible worship, a [illegible]

[illegible] and meditation upon *satyam* (*brahman*).

Several ideas connected with *ṛta* and *ṛtu* we encountered qualifying *deva*.

a) *Ṛtāvan*: cf. RV. 2,27,4: 3,14,2: 4,10,7: 8,25,1: 4: cf. also 4,2,1: and 7,1,19: 7,3,1: Grassmann, o.c., p. 286 translates it as Geldner in his Rig Veda translation 1st ed. 1923: "die Wahrheit liebend"; 2nd ed. 1951: "die Wahrheit besitzend". In my opinion Lüders' "Truth" is right.

the same priestly task, but it should be treated separately as the deeper contents are quite different. Grassmann, in his Wörterbuch zum RV. p. 287 col. 2 explains: "zur regelmässigen Zeit (*ṛtu*) opferend (*ij* from *yaj*). 2. m. Priester"; Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary p. 181: "Ved. Sacrifing at the proper *seasons*, sacrificing regularly; (k) m. a priest;" and in the Dictionnaire Sanskrit—Français by N. Stchoupak, L. Nitti et L. Renou p. 164: "(nom.-k) prêtre; n. d'une catégorie d'officiants vediques:". All three derive *ṛtvij* from *ṛtu* and M. Williams, o.c., p. 180 states as basic meaning: "any settled point of time, a fixed *time*; time appointed for sacrifices and their regular worship, right time, fit season etc., etc." Dict. S.-Fr. p. 164 mentions: "époque, période; saison."

Has *ṛtu* any connexion in form or in meaning with *ṛta*? Walde-Pokorny, Vergl. Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen, *I, p. 70* holds this opinion. So does M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgef. etm. Wtb. d. Altind. p. 122 f. The Sanskrit scholars have had great difficulties in explaining the term *ṛta*. Grassmann, o.c. 282: "Das Festgesetzte, das göttliche Gesetz, die unveränderliche Ordnung oder Regel. Andererseits bezeichnet es etwas als "passend, gebührend, *recht*", oder Personen als "tüchtig zu etwas, als heilig, fromm, rechtschaffen", woraus denn für das neutrum der Begriff der "heiligen oder frommen Werke" entspringt".

M. Williams *does not differ; however, he gave another meaning in* addition: "according to Sāyaṇa: "sacrifice: water". Lüders, Varuṇa, I, p. 13 considers the connexion of *ṛta* with water of the greatest importance.

Proceeding *in* this way of thinking we *could* accept the *ṛtvij* as a priest, *or* one who makes sacrifices at regular hours, or *according* to the right order, in accord with the proper rules. So, one could consider this as just another epithet to *deva*, giving no further explanation of the true contents of *deva*.

Moreover, priesthood and appointment for priestly duties by gods and men surely do not suggest the idea of "GOD" with a capital G. God is the one who is *offered* to. Certainly not the *one* who sacrifices in person or even a step lower, the functionary of sacrifice, who is at service of the *havispati* „the sacrifing human being". In this research we shall encounter a great number of adjectives to the term *deva*. But considering this problem in a matter-of-fact way we certainly do not often feel forced to accept that the Vedic Indian saw *deva* as God, in the strict sense. But if he ever did, he certainly did here, where we discover some connexion with the term *ṛta*.

Lüders holds that in the Vedas *ṛta* means Truth. "Ich behaupte nun, dasz ihre Erklärung durchaus richtig ist und dasz *ṛta* auch im

Veda nur "Wahrheit" bedeutet" (o.c. p. 14). "Ihre" have to be seen as the ancient Indian theologians. The Indian saw "Truth" as the great power behind everything spiritual as well as the physical world; (cf. Lüders, o.c. p. 15) and the author concludes: "Dem arischen Inder galt also die Wahrheit als die höchste Macht, als die letzte Ursache alles Seins" (cf. p. 24). In my opinion *ṛta* and later *Brahman* may be considered as God in sensu stricto; however, we do not leave out Lüder's note: "Man hat das *ṛta* in Indien niemals personifiziert; kultische Verehrung hat es nicht genossen." With this *ṛta* the *devas* have close relations: *ṛtasya yonim āsadam* 3,62,13: and Lüders, o.c., p. 25 observes that *ṛtasya sadas* will be later on rendered by *satyaloka* — that is the highest possible heavenly space. When Lüders looks closely into the true contents of this *yonir ṛtasya*, we learn that they are the heavenly waters. Water, over which one makes a contract or takes an oath. This is the very reason why an oath and contract are valid and unrescindable, and also why a broken word is considered as a capital sin. *ṛtasya yoniḥ* is "*udaka*" "water" according to the older theologians (Lüders, o.c. p. 26): "Niemals ist dort der Schosz des *ṛta* etwas anderes als jene Wasserflut im höchsten Himmel am Nabel der Welt."

Tad yat tat satyam asau sa ādityaḥ BAU. 5,5,2: and S. Br. 6,7,1,2: relate to us that *yat satyam*, with *asau sa ādityaḥ*. In this connexion we may point to the work of Prof. Dr. B. A. G. Vroklage [4]), much too early departed from us, in which he ascertains that the sky, sun in the sky, stands for God in sensu stricto, in the old myths and fables. It is even so in every bit of thinking of primitive man. So Prof. Gonda told me in a conversation about this subject, when we spoke about the lack of cultus in *Brahman*: "The ancient Indian generally speaking, did not revere that which he did not fear." My own experience taught me the very same. The Indians motive for cultus, for sacrifice and rites was always, the deadly fright they had of the tremendous power of the *devās* and *devatās*. Yet, I encountered too a somewhat reasonable and sensible worship, a sort of religious-minded submissiveness to *Atmā-Brahman*. I should like to formulate this in this way: public and popular worship and cultus of the dreaded *devas*, and private devotion and meditation upon *satyam (brahman)*.

Several ideas connected with *ṛta* and *ṛtu* we encountered qualifying *deva*.

a) *Ṛtāvan*: cf. RV. 2,27,4: 3,14,2: 4,10,7: 8,25,1: 4: cf. also 4,2,1: and 7,1,19: 7,3,1: Grassmann, o.c., p. 286 translates it as Geldner in his Rig Veda translation 1st ed. 1923: "die Wahrheit liebend"; 2nd ed. 1951: "die Wahrheit besitzend". In my opinion Lüders' "Truth" is right.

Noteworthy in this connexion is that *ṛtâvan* occurs most often with the Adityas, especially Mitra-Varuṇa and also with Agni. The number of occurrences of this word with the other devas is negligeable. Only Heaven-and-Earth are connected with it a few times more than the group of *devas*. It is strange that it is closely connected with Varuṇa as he is considered the defender and trustee of the *ṛta*?

Sometimes we meet the feminine *ṛtavarī* with *devī* RV. 4,56,2: and Geldner translates here: "Gesetztreu".

b) *ṛtajāta* RV. 9,108,8: Lüders renders this rightly as: "Aus der Wahrheit erzeugt" (o.c., p. 23) and Grassmann, o.c., p. 286: "durch das heilige Opferwerk erzeugt; heilig geartet, heilig". It is used for Agni, the Adityas, the Maruts and in texts of praises.

c) *ṛtapeśas cf. 5,66,1: which Geldner renders:* "dessen Schmuck das Gesetz ist".

Grassmann, o.c. 286: "herrliche Gestalt habend". It is worth *noticing that this only once-occurring term is used for Varuṇa.*

d) *ṛtā-vṛdh*. Lüders: "durch die Wahrheit wachsend" 10,65,3: and again Grassmann: "an Recht, Gerechtigkeit, Frömmigkeit sich freuend". Most often used for Mitra-Varuna, it does occur with the *devas* as well. Geldner renders more like Lüders: "die Mehrer der Wahrheit", cf. RV. 6,50,14:.

e) RV. 9,108,8: calls Soma *ṛtam bṛhat:* "the solid (or fundamental) [8]) Truth". Or according to Geldner: "das hohe Gesetz selbst". It is not clear why the 2nd edition changed the translation of *ṛta*: "Wahrheit" (of 1t ed.) into "Gesetz".

f) *ṛta* causes *dakṣam* "Tatkraft" (so Geldner) to the *deva*. *ṛtam ṛtena śapanteṣiram dakṣam āśāte* RV. 5,68,4:. It keeps the *devas* together cf. 10,12,2: *devo devān paribhūr ṛtena. Devaḥ* is Agni. Geldner renders *ṛtena* by "Opferordnung", while he translates in 10,37,1: *ṛtam* by: "dieses wahre Wort". There we read *maho devāya tad ṛtaṃ saparyata:* "Dem groszen Gotte (Sūrya) weihet dieses wahre (Wort)".

g) Together with *ṛtu* I found *ṛtupā ṛtūnām:* "Hüter der Zeiten", cf. 5,12,3: as an epithet to *deva* Agni. But Grassmann translates the following texts by: "zur regelmässigen Opferzeit trinkend". RV. 3,20,4: 47,3: 4,34,7: 5,12,3:.

5. A number of passages in the RV. in which *deva* occurs — *it is* true — do not show any direct deeper meaning, but the context does certainly point out to us, that *deva* is someone very high, exalted and mighty. Something that is far superior to us. So 1,1,5: *Agnir*

hotā kavikratuḥ satyaś citraśravastamaḥ devo devebhir ā gamat. An [illegible]

yeva dhārāsaścantī pīpayad deva citrā, tām asmabhyam pramatiṃ jātavedo vaso rāsva sumatiṃ viśvajanyām. "Deine Fürsorge, O Agni, die wie der Strom des Berges unversieglich quillt, die wunderbare, o Gott, die gewähre uns, o Jātavedas, (und) deine Gunst, die allen Menschen gehört, du Guter" (Geldner's rendering). Here we find such an accumulation of adjectives and appositions: *parvatasya, dhārāsaścantī pīpayad, citra, pramatim, sumatim,* that we certainly receive the impression of someone august and exalted. Super-human. Elsewhere we come across epithets, that do not point to something strictly divine, but doubtless hint at some sublime being e.g. 3,9,1: and 4,1,1: *subhāgam* where Geldner renders in his 1st ed. "hold", but in the 2nd ed. he changed that into "schönleuchtend" or better "reich"; *sudīditim:* "thoroughly brilliant", or *anehasam* "unangefochten". 3,16,3: speaks of *suvīryam* "herolike courage", so 3,26,1: speaks of *anuṣatyaṃ* "sticking to a once given word" and *svarvidam* "finder of the sun". Elsewhere it occurs: (cf. 3,59,6:) deva described as *dyumnaṃ citraśravastamam:* "ruhmglänzend seine Herrlichkeit". (Geldner) Again 6,49,9: we find purely "human" adjectives, but their accumulations make us believe that the composer wanted to indicate something more sublime than the terms directly express. Other passages name the *devas:* "pure": *pāvakaḥ* (cf. 7,3,1:) and "exalted" *pramahasaḥ* (7,66,2:)*vibhvamahasaḥ* (10,93,3:) "allherrlich" as Geldner renders it. Or *puṣkarasraj* "crowned by lotuses (10,184,2:)." Leaving out the context no one should doubt that there is any forcing argument in those terms for accepting a divine or supernormal being. But reading, I should like to say, casting those hymns and considering the accumulations of adjectives, one is struck by the helplessness in expressing a sublime dignity. They suggest something superior. More I cannot prove and do not want to state.

In the end we find some texts, where we observe a *deva,* in casu Agni mentioned as *devo deveṣu cf. 4,2,1:* Moreover there occur a number of passages that look quite *similar, cf. 4,2,1: martyeṣv amṛta:* "the immortal among the mortals, or "possessor of Truth" *ṛtāvan,* and again *devo deveṣu.* The context suggests *that the* being concerned has been granted the privilege to partake of the title *deva:* as a most august mortal, he is praised a *deva.* However, 4,1,9: points out quite clearly that the Vedic Indian did see *the deva* as belonging to a superhuman sphere: *devo martasya sadhanitvam āpa,* and Geldner renders: "Du Gott bist in die Gemeinschaft der Sterblichen eingetreten". So

Noteworthy in this connexion is that *ṛtāvan* occurs most often with the Adityas, especially Mitra-Varuṇa and also with Agni. The number of occurrences of this word with the other devas is negligeable. Only Heaven-and-Earth are connected with it a few times more than the group of *devas*. It is strange that it is closely connected with Varuṇa as he is considered the defender and trustee of the *ṛta*?

Sometimes we meet the feminine *ṛtavarī* with *devī* RV. 4,56,2: and Geldner translates here: "Gesetztreu".

b) *ṛtajāta* RV. 9,108,8: Lüders renders this rightly as: "Aus der Wahrheit erzeugt" (o.c., p. 23) and Grassmann, o.c., p. 286: "durch das heilige Opferwerk erzeugt; heilig geartet, heilig". It is used for Agni, the Adityas, the Maruts and in texts of praises.

c) *ṛtapeśas* cf. 5,66,1: which Geldner renders: "dessen Schmuck das Gesetz ist".

Grassmann, o.c. 286: "herrliche Gestalt habend". It is worth noticing that this only once-occurring term is used for Varuṇa.

d) *ṛtā-vṛdh*. Lüders: "durch die Wahrheit wachsend" 10,65,3: and again Grassmann: "an Recht, Gerechtigkeit, Frömmigkeit sich freuend". Most often used for Mitra-Varuṇa, it does occur with the *devas* as well. Geldner renders more like Lüders: "die Mehrer der Wahrheit", cf. RV. 6,50,14:.

e) RV. 9,108,8: calls Soma *ṛtam bṛhat:* "the solid (or fundamental) [5]) Truth". Or according to Geldner: "das hohe Gesetz selbst". It is not clear why the 2nd edition changed the translation of *ṛta:* "Wahrheit" (of 1t ed.) into "Gesetz".

f) *ṛta* causes *dakṣam* "Tatkraft" (so Geldner) to the *deva*. *ṛtam ṛtena śapanteṣiraṃ dakṣam āśāte* RV. 5,68,4:. It keeps the *devas* together cf. 10,12,2: *devo devān paribhūr ṛtena. Devaḥ* is Agni. Geldner renders *ṛtena* by "Opferordnung", while he translates in 10,37,1: *ṛtam* by: "dieses wahre Wort". There we read *maho devāya tad ṛtaṃ saparyata:* "Dem groszen Gotte (Sūrya) weihet dieses wahre (Wort)".

g) Together with *ṛtu* I found *ṛtupā ṛtūnām:* "Hüter der Zeiten", cf. 5,12,3: as an epithet to *deva* Agni. But Grassmann translates the following texts by: "zur regelmässigen Opferzeit trinkend". RV. 3,20,4: 47,3: 4,34,7: 5,12,3:.

5. A number of passages in the RV. in which *deva* occurs — it is true — do not show any direct deeper meaning, but the context does certainly point out to us, that *deva* is someone very high, exalted and mighty. Something that is far superior to us. So 1,1,5: *Agnir*

hotā kavikratuḥ satyaś citraśravastamaḥ devo devebhir ā gamat. An accumulation of qualities as *hotā, kavikratuḥ, citraśravastamaḥ* certainly does suggest something more behind *deva*. So does 2,2,6: 3,1: 28,1: 33,15: 3,1,1: 7,9: 14,5: 53,15:. And 3,57,6: *yā te agne parvatasyeva dhārāsaścantī pīpayad deva citrā, tām asmabhyam pramatiṃ jātavedo vaso rāsva sumatiṃ viśvajanyām.* "Deine Fürsorge, O Agni, die wie der Strom des Berges unversieglich quillt, die wunderbare, o Gott, die gewähre uns, o Jātavedas, (und) deine Gunst, die allen Menschen gehört, du Guter" (Geldner's rendering). Here we find such an accumulation of adjectives and appositions: *parvatasya, dhārāsaścantī pīpayad, citra, pramatim, sumatim,* that we certainly receive the impression of someone august and exalted. Super-human. Elsewhere we come across epithets, that do not point to something strictly divine, but doubtless hint at some sublime being e.g. 3,9,1: and 4,1,1: *subhāgam* where Geldner renders in his 1st ed. "hold", but in the 2nd ed. he changed that into "schönleuchtend" or better "reich"; *sudidītim*: "thoroughly brilliant", or *anehasam* "unangefochten". 3,16,3: speaks of *suvīryam* "herolike courage", so 3,26,1: speaks of *anuṣatyaṃ* "sticking to a once given word" and *svarvidam* "finder of the sun". Elsewhere it occurs: (cf. 3,59,6:) deva described as *dyumnaṃ citraśravastamam*: "ruhmglänzend seine Herrlichkeit". (Geldner) Again 6,49,9: we find purely "human" adjectives, but their accumulations make us believe that the composer wanted to indicate something more sublime than the terms directly express. Other passages name the *devas* "pure": *pāvakaḥ* (cf. 7,3,1:) and "exalted" *pramahasaḥ* (7,66,2:)*viśvamahasaḥ* (10,93,3:) "allherrlich" as Geldner renders it. Or *puṣkarasraj* "crowned by lotuses (10,184,2:)." Leaving out the context no one should doubt that there is any forcing argument in those terms for accepting a divine or supernormal being. But reading, I should like to say, tasting those hymns and considering the accumulations of adjectives, one is struck by the helplessness in expressing a sublime dignity. They suggest something superior. More I cannot prove and do not want to state.

In the end we find some texts, where we observe a *deva*, in casu Agni mentioned as *devo deveṣu* cf. 4,2,1: Moreover there occur a number of passages that look quise similar, cf. 4,2,1: *martyeṣu amṛtaḥ* "the immortal among the mortals, or "possessor of Truth" *ṛtāvan*, and again *devo deveṣu*. The context suggests that the being concerned has been granted the privilege to partake of the title *deva* ... august mortal ... t clearly that th ... : human sphere ... "Du Gott bis ... Geldner renders: "Du Gott bis... Gemeinschaft der Sterblichen eingetreten". So

we may now already conclude that any meaning of the term *deva* that implies less than superhuman power, certainly is not sure, as in those cases no meaning would be left at all. So it is no rash conclusion to state that the composers of the RV. considered *deva* as something superhuman.

6. The *devas* are named as protectors of mankind and as governing nations. This trait occurs in several gradations and shades: *carṣaṇīdhṛt* (1,3,7: 4,17,20:) Governing races. cf. 8,96,20: 4,1,2: 3,37,4: 59,6: and protecting nations: 10,89,1:. Frequently we hear the *devas* invoked for their protection *sakṣva* cf. 1,42,1: and *śarmant syāma tava:* "we want to be under your protection and guardianship", cf. 1,94,13:. I do not want to say that one would meet everywhere this idea in the strict sense of protection: several circumlocutions do occur e.g. *evayātā durmatīnām:* "one who wards off mishap." Or: *hantā pāpatya* "killer of evil"; *tratā viprasya* "protector of the wise": *rakṣahaṇam* cf. 1,129,11:. Numberless times passages occur where the context vaguely of clearly points to this protecting trait of character of the *devas*, even favour and friendship included, cf. 1,138,1: 139,1: 3: 6: [6]). Elsewhere we read calls like: *āre asmad* cf. 4,11,6: in order to keep evil far off. So they ward off enemies and protect against hatred and ill-will, cf. 6,2,11: [7]).

Some *devas* receive the epithet of protector in all kind of forms and shades. Agni e.g. 5,4,8: 6,2,11: 3,1: 11,6: 13,1: 14,4: 16,27: 30: 32: and 6,51,13:. Indra 6,44,7: 45,5: 47,20: 21: 29: 46,6: 8: 9:, Savitṛ 6,50,8: The Aśvins 10,93,6: Viśve devas 5,42,16: where Geldner translates: "Jeder Gott soll für mich gut zu errufen sein", cf. also 5,50,2: 10,93,3:. These calls for help and rescue and protection occur so frequently, that we feel forced to believe, that their protective powers and, implicitly, their supremacy over ill and evil, are some of the most characteristic traits of the concept of *deva*.

However, we come across the interesting passage 1,96,1: [8]) *devā agniṃ dhārayan*, which Geldner renders: "die Götter erhalten Agni den Schätzespender". Agni is not the one who protects, but the person whom the devas protect and keep in being.

Another aspect of protecting the term *asridh* teaches us, cf. 1,89,3: 13,9: 3,58,7: 4,32,24: 45,4: 5,46,4: 9,86,18:. This term is translated by M. Williams, p. 108: "not doing harm, uninjured, unfatigued, pious, peaceable;" Though outwardly quite negative, one is able to discover some positive nuance, i.e. their inner nature and true being is peaceful and is not out harm; and so by inmost feeling they are against distress and evil.

7. Another quality ascribed to the *devas* is that of drinking the somadraught. Everywhere we find invitations to *somapītī*: "the drinking of *Soma*". So: *Sutam ā ganta* cf. 1,3,8: and passim in RV. the *devas* are pressed for this heavenly and sacrificial feast [8]).

Examining the 9th maṇḍala of the RV. we discern quite clearly that to drink the *Soma* and the invitation to do so, is something essential and peculiar to the *devas*. They like it (9,62,21:) and it has been pressed most of all for them, cf. 9,99,7: 103,6: 105,3: 109,5: 12: etc. According to the Indian way of thinking we do find here a specific means of discrimination between *devas* and other beings. *Soma* belongs to the *deva*. By pressing the *soma* and its libations one propitiates the *devas*; and by means of the somadraught one is able to receive any gift from them. Even at times we come across soma mentioned as *deva*.

8. Another adjective used in connection with the *devas* or with the names of several of them is: *adruh*. Grassmann, p. 41, renders: "nicht schädigend, wohlwollend (von den Göttern)" and quite rightly he stresses this [illegible] Williams, o.c. p. 19 translates: [illegible] ldner translates: "ohne Falsch, [illegible] 1,21: 4,56,2: 5,68,4:. Another term with about the same contents is *adabha*. It too means "without treachery and falsity", but it still has some other shades. Therein is a nuance of: "reliable" or "zuverlässig", especially where it is related to a protective force and the will to protect, of the *devas*, cf. 5,86,5:. A. A. Macdonell in Vedic Mythology, p. 18 considers this epithet as certain proof of the moral character of the *devas*: "The character of the Vedic gods is also moral", he states. "All the gods are "true" and "not deceitful", being throughout the friends and guardians of honesty and righteousness."

Even nowadays the Indian considers this trait of character as the highest virtue. He has a certain respect for simpleness and for someone that does not fathom his aims. The Indian like any oriental considers tricks and deceit as a kind of sharpwittedness and sagacity. But still, he feels the meanness of it too. He has respect for the noble soul, who does not surmise deceit and fraud. On the contrary he does not feel like appreciating the one who sees through him. Moreover he feels cheated himself, if someone, though kind and thoughtful, still believes that he could be hoodwinked also. Why does he feel hurt? Because in the man's behaviour he detects a kind of fraud. On the other hand, he does not like outspokenness and a talk straight from the shoulder. In the mentality of the Indian of to-day, we clearly find the emotional value of *adruh* and *adabha* "deceitless". But if one may agree with Macdonell's opinion, that

we may now already conclude that any meaning of the term *deva* that implies less than superhuman power, certainly is not sure, as in those cases no meaning would be left at all. So it is no rash conclusion to state that the composers of the RV. considered *deva* as something superhuman.

6. The *devas* are named as protectors of mankind and as governing nations. This trait occurs in several gradations and shades: *carṣaṇīdhṛt* (1,3,7: 4,17,20:) Governing races. cf. 8,96,20: 4,1,2: 3,37,4: 59,6: and protecting nations: 10,89,1:. Frequently we hear the *devas* invoked for their protection *sakṣva* cf. 1,42,1: and *śarmaṇi syāma tava:* "we want to be under your protection and guardianship", cf. 1,94,13:. I do not want to say that one would meet everywhere this idea in the strict sense of protection: several circumlocutions do occur e.g. *evayātā durmatīnām:* "one who wards off mishap." Or: *hantā pāpasya* "killer of evil"; *tratā viprasya* "protector of the wise": *rakṣahaṇam* cf. 1,129,11:. Numberless times passages occur where the context vaguely of clearly points to this protecting trait of character of the *devas*, even favour and friendship included, cf. 1,138,1: 139,1: 3: 6:[6]). Elsewhere we read calls like: *āre asmad* cf. 4,11,6: in order to keep evil far off. So they ward off enemies and protect against hatred and ill-will, cf. 6,2,11:[7]).

Some *devas* receive the epithet of protector in all kind of forms and shades. Agni e.g. 5,4,8: 6,2,11: 3,1: 11,6: 13,1: 14,4: 16,27: 30: 32: and 6,51,13:. Indra 6,44,7: 45,5: 47,20: 21: 29: 46,6: 8: 9:, Savitṛ 6,50,8: The Aśvins 10,93,6: Viśve devas 5,42,16: where Geldner translates: "Jeder Gott soll für mich gut zu errufen sein", cf. also 5,50,2: 10,93,3:. These calls for help and rescue and protection occur so frequently, that we feel forced to believe, that their protective powers and, implicitly, their supremacy over ill and evil, are some of the most characteristic traits of the concept of *deva*.

However, we come across the interesting passage 1,96,1:[8]) *devā agniṃ dhārayan*, which Geldner renders: "die Götter erhalten Agni den Schätzespender". Agni is *not* the one who protects, but the person whom the devas protect and keep in being.

Another aspect of protecting the term *asridh* teaches us, cf. 1,89,3: 13,9: 3,58,7: 4,32,24: 45,4: 5,46,4: 9,86,18:. This term is translated by M. Williams, p. 108: "not doing harm, uninjured, unfatigued, pious, peaceable;" Though outwardly quite negative, one is able to discover some positive nuance, i.e. their inner nature and true being is peaceful and is not out harm; and so by inmost feeling they are against distress and evil.

Gonda translates in his Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive, p. 89, note 174, and Geldner in his 1st and 2nd edition as well.

In the present tense it has the meaning of "being busy" or "making active" or "instigating" or "urging on" etc. We meet this term often with *ūtaye*, as well the verb *av*: "to help, to give assistance" cf. 1,31,8: 9: 35,10: 11: 36,13: 144,5: 4,1,20: 5,9,1: and 3,9,1:.

There are of course in use other expressions with the same sense, the gods are e.g. *ūmāḥ*: "helping" and *suhavāsaḥ* "easy to invoke", cf. 4,19,1:.

In any case, this trait points out to us the kindheartedness of the *deva* on some occasions and also that the Vedic Indian felt dependent on them in order to surmount difficulties. In my opinion this very trait of dependence, or at least the indication of the same, teaches us some true godliness in the term *deva*.

Closely connected with those terms are words expressing the idea of: "favouring" like: *no devā avasā gamann* ... (RV. 1,89,7:) or *kalyāṇa* 1,31,9: cf. 2,23,19: *viśvam tad bhadram yad avanti devāḥ* ...: "Everything is favouring us if the *devas* are with us." Here it is that Agni plays a prominent part as a mediator [illegible]

[illegible]

However the term *ning* is not quite clear. In any case we learn that their favour is of paramount importance to man. The *devas* are in many ways the patrons of the human beings and we are quite dependent on them e.g. for wealth: cf. 1,159,1: 5: 91,1: 15,8: 3,11,9: 14,6: 54,21: 4,2,11; 6,64,4: 60,14: and also 5,50,5:.

For liberty we need them: cf. 1,59,5: 3,34,7: and also 7,98,3:.

For power and strength: cf. 1,74,9: 2,20,8: where the gods are said to grant strength and victory to Indra; cf. also 6,16,12:.

For glory: *bhāgam deveṣu śravase*, cf. 1,73,5:.

For fertility cf. 1,185,9: 190,8: 2,11,13: 3,4,9: They give cows, 1,169,8:. Something that shows the *devas* in higher regions of might and power, is that they grant us life, cf. 1,73,5: 4,36,3: (youth) and children, cf. 1,190,8:. They give life and happiness too, cf. 2,2,6: 5,50,5: 6,50,11:.

Yet, those summed up qualities may show their kind character, but it would be an exaggeration to imply the *devas* to be absolutely selfless. This truly divine trait, showing infinite love and total independence on everything, is quite unknown to them. Their kindness is only to be activated by grants and sacrifices from man's side. It is no more than a relation of: do ut possis dare; compare 1,26,8: *svagnayo hi vāryam devāso dadhire ca naḥ*. „So when the *devas* have received a good offering (fire) they grant us also our wishes. We believe that we

those terms point to high morality, is still an open question to me. Relating to Indian ethics, McKenzie in his book: Hindu Ethics, Oxford, 1922, tells us that the moral features are far less prominent than the physical in the character of the Vedic Gods. However, one cannot say that they are immoral. Mitra-Varuṇa are the watchers of mankind, the sun is their eye, which reports the deeds of man. Nothing can happen without Varuṇa's knowledge or without his sanction. Even the Gods themselves follow his decree; cf. 8,41,7:.

Bloomfield in his Religion of the Veda (p. 126) goes too far in saying that Varuṇa, who is the lord of *ṛta*, finds in this *ṛta* a fairly complete system of ethics, *a kind of counsel of perfection.* Rather we may see *ṛta* as truth, says McKenzie, o.c. p. 8. Though Bṛhaspati holds up the law next to Varuṇa, he is a "guilt avenger" (2,23,17:) and with him all the Adityas. "We find (McKenzie writes) these and other gods besought to loosen their worshippers from sin and to forgive sin". RV. 1,185,8: gives a classification of sins, committed against the gods, our friends and our houses' chieftain. So RV. 5,85,7: relates: sins committed against the man who loves us, a brother, friend or comrade, the neighbour ever with us or a stranger. Lying is a sin against *ṛta* ("truth") and waters are used to remove from the worshipper the sin of lying and false oaths. Crimes of fraud and violence are condemned. Even hatred is sinful. Sin is sometimes regarded as disobedience of the commands of the gods, especially of Varuṇa, though also of Indra, Agni and other gods (cf. RV. 2,28,5: ff.) and this disobedience leads to anger on the part of the god and to punishments (cf. 2,29,5:). This punishment is seen as "a dark cave" *narakasthānam (? 7,104,3:) and elsewhere death, so ascertains* Mc Kenzie (o.c. p. 12).

However in the AV. another spirit is growing and though we still encounter some passages about Varuṇa as quoted above, the gods have almost completely lost their ethical traits. Even Varuṇa is fast losing his significance, and Mc Kenzie wrote: "No god is endorsed with the moral supremacy among the gods, which belonged to him" (o.c., p. 18—19) [10]).

Sin was considered a magical substance (cf. Oldenberg, Religion des Veda, p. 317—318). So by charms sin is forgiven. One needs no free will to commit a sin; (cf. Mc Kenzie, o.c., p. 20) and further on the same author states: *"Sin is regarded almost as something* contagious, passed on from one being to another — even between men and devas." So sin grew to something quasi physical.

9. An often-used epithet is derived from the root *tuj*, e.g. RV. 1,11,5: *tvāṃ devā abibhyuṣas tujyamānāsa āviṣuḥ*: "to thee the gods *have rendered assistance, frightened of him who does not fear"* So

Gonda translates in his Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive, p. 89, note 174, and Geldner in his 1st and 2nd edition as well.

In the present tense it has the meaning of "being busy" or "making active" or "instigating" or "urging on" etc. We meet this term often with *ūtaye*, as well the verb *av*: "to help, to give assistance" cf. 1,31,8: 9: 35,10: 11: 36,13: 144,5: 4,1,20: 5,9,1: and 3,9,1:.

There are of course in use other expressions with the same sense, the gods are e.g. *ūmāḥ*: "helping" and *suhavāsaḥ* "easy to invoke", cf. 4,19,1:.

In any case, this trait points out to us the kindheartedness of the *deva* on some occasions and also that the Vedic Indian felt dependent on them in order to surmount difficulties. In my opinion this very trait of dependence, or at least the indication of the same, teaches us some true godliness in the term *deva*.

Closely connected with those terms are words expressing the idea of: "favouring" like: *no devā avasā gamann* ... (RV. 1,89,7:) or *kalyāṇa* 1,31,9: cf. 2,23,19: *viśvaṃ tad bhadraṃ yad avanti devāḥ* ...: "Everything is favouring us if the *devas* are with us." Here it is that Agni plays a prominent part as a mediator. He makes friendship with the devas by praising and lauding them; cf. 3,3,1: *devān* ... *duvasyati*; and in 3,3,7: he is called *uśig devānām*: "intercessor with the devas". However the term *uśig* is not quite clear. In any case we learn that their favour is of paramount *importance to man. The devas* are in many ways the patrons of the human beings and we are quite dependent on them e.g. for wealth: cf. 1,159,1: 5: 91,1: 15,8: 3,11,9: 14,6: 54,21: 4,2,11: 6,64,4: 60,14: and also 5,50,5:.

For liberty we need them: cf. 1,59,5: 3,34,7: and also 7,98,3:.

For power and strength: cf. 1,74,9: 2,20,8: where the gods are said to grant strength and victory to Indra; cf. also 6,16,12:.

For glory: *bhāgam deveṣu śravase*, cf. 1,73,5:.

For fertility cf. 1,185,9: 190,8: 2,11,13: 3,4,9: They give cows, 1,169,8:. Something that shows the *devas* in higher regions of might and power, is that they grant us life, cf. 1,73,5: 4,36,3: (youth) and children, cf. 1,190,8:. They give life and happiness too, cf. 2,2,6: 5,50,5: 6,50,11:.

Yet, those summed up qualities may show their kind character, but it would be an exaggeration to imply the devas to be absolutely selfless. This truly divine trait, showing infinite love and total independence on everything, is quite unknown to them. Their kindness is only to be activated by grants and sacrifices from man's side. It is no more than a relation of: do ut possis dare; compare 1,26,8: *svagnayo hi vāryaṃ devāso dadhire ca naḥ*. „So when the *devas* have received a good offering (fire) they grant us also our wishes. We believe that we

have a good offering"; cf. also 1,77,2: 83,2: 173,13: 5,42,3: 6,51,12: 68,6: 8: 7,17,7: 8,64,2: 10,132,1: 148,4:. We meet this "do ut des" relation oftener in primitive society. So we may not call it too bad a name. *This primitive man thinks of god according to his own* ideas. Where he is out for things like wealth and health, where he is conscious that sacrifices ought to be offered to his gods, he easily gives evidence of the above mentioned mentality; cf. Bh. Gīta 3,11: *devān bhāvayatānena, te devā bhāvayantu vaḥ parasparaṃ bhāvayantaḥ, śreyaḥ param avāpsyatha.* „By this foster ye the gods and let the gods foster you. Thus fostering each other you shall attain to the supreme good" [11]). The function of "to give" and "to receive" very often is based upon a relation of reciprocity.

11. The relationship of the *devas* and sacrifice.

It is a human custom to show one's submissiveness in the ritual token of sacrifice. The rendering of oneself, of one's daughters or sons, to the Māharājā, putting down one's pagri at the feet of the person offended or one's creditor, are even nowadays the very tokens of one's deepest dependence on the person concerned. Immediately we may draw the conclusion that by withdrawing some personal property from daily use, and to hand it over to some august personality, is no absolute proof for the divinity of the subject concerned. It is perhaps *interesting to add that the creditor or māharājā or the offended* person in such a case even nowadays is called: *Deva* as I found myself. However, if one relation is obvious, it is the connection between *devas* and offerings.

a) The *devas* have some contact with rites, and very often Agni is requested to carry the *devas* to the place of sacrifice, cf. 1,13,1: 2: 4: 14,12: 15,4: 5,11,2: 14,1: so other passages without number.

b) The *devas* themselves are time and again *invited* to the offerings to seat themselves upon the Barhis (sacrificial grass), to eat from the offerings and to drink the somadraught cf. 3,25,4: 5,51,3: *devān upa hvaye* cf. RV. 1,13,12: 44,4: 152,7: 186,1: [12]).

c) Sacrificial offerings belong to the *devas:* they are their food. *cf.* 4,15,2: *7*,11,2: 1: 14,1: 10,70,2: *187*,6: 11:.

d) The *devas* long for those offerings: cf. 1,12,4: 162,11: 187,6,11: 188,10: 2,37,6: 6,52,8: 7,82,7: etc.

e) *They are invited to support the sacrifice: yajñeṣu ... īḷate* cf. 1,15,7: 3,8,8: 5,21,3: 4:. On this support the complete outcome and results depend. *Here we may again see an indication of the magic* conception. Moreover the *devas* themselves ought *to give assistance for the required result by looking for the precise and correct performance* of the sacrificial act: cf. 1,18,8:!

f) The *devas* are the objects of offering: *devān yaja:* "honour the *devas* with sacrifices" can be met with throughout the entire RV. cf. 1,15,12: 20,8: 163,13: 162,21: 2,41,20: 3,14,5: 5,5,11: 6,71,6:. Of course the *devas* have to accept the offerings cf. 1,139,11: *devāso yajñam imam juṣadhvam;* They eat the gift offered: *adanty āhutam* cf. 1,94,3:.

g) In short: the *devas* are worthy to receive sacrifices, or as Geldner translates: "opferberechtigt". We meet the following terms: *yajatra* and *yajata:* cf. 1,186,11: 2,29,6: 3,57,5: *7,75,7: 10,64,14:* 93,3: Vāl. 9,1: also *yajñīya* cf. 1,16,2:[25]) and *yajatha* cf. 3,5,9:.

h) Another factor I could trace in some texts is that sacrifice has a power over the *devas* and they themselves are dependent on this sacrifice, and possibly this is the reason why sometimes the *devas* offer to sacrifice cf. 1,164,50: 10,90,16: 124,6: Geldner adds to 1,164,50: "Nach Sāyaṇa sind es die *karmadevāḥ* deren Erfolg auf Opfer usw. beruht, oder die Adityas und die Aṅgiras' heiszen die Sādhyagötter wofür er sich auf Ait. Br. 1,16,36—39: beruft." And Geldner renders himself I, p. 236: "Mit Opfer opferten die Götter dem Opfer. Dies waren die ersten Bräuche. Diese Mächte folgten in den Himmel nach, in dem die früheren Götter, die Sādhya's sich befinden."

i) At times one might almost believe, as we mentioned above, that the *devas* favour the sacrifice and are obedient to it; cf. 3,8,8: *sajoṣaso yajñam avantu:* "They must (imperative form) favour the sacrifice unanimously". It seems that in sacrificial performances the *devas* are powers to join and to do what they are requested to!

j) The best among all kinds of offering appears to be the soma beverage cf. 9,67,28: and the invitations to *somapītaye* are really numberless cf. 3,25,4: and 5,51,3:. This very *soma* is mentioned as a *deva* itself: *devo deveṣu ābhagaḥ;* cf. 1,136,4: 7,21,1: 9,3,9: 6,7: 42,2: 99,7· 103,6.

k) The sacrificial post is called a god *deva: vanaspate deva* cf. 1,13,11: 142,11: and it is the post where the sacrificial animal has to be tied. The untying of the victim is a sort of sacrifice in itself and in 1,142,11: is said that the sacrificial post is offering itself. The horse as a victim is strengthened by the *devas* cf. 1,163,8: 9:. Yet, the *devas* themselves have great respect for this horse: "die Götter kamen zu dessen Opfermahl, der als erster das Rennpferd bestieg" *(1,163,9:).*

The Ghee, offered or yet to be offered, is presented to us as a *maha deva* cf. 4,58,3; So are the soma-pressing-stones: *ubhā devāv divaica tmaica rājathah* cf. 5,38,3:. And in 8,90,16: we hear the cow named as *devī*. M. Muuss undertook special research on this topic of the holy

have a good offering"; cf. also 1,77,2: 83,2: 173,13: 5,42,3: 6,51,12: 68,6: 8: 7,17,7: 8,64,2: 10,132,1: 148,4:. We meet this "do ut des" relation oftener in primitive society. So we may not call it too bad a name. This primitive man thinks of god according to his own ideas. Where he is out for things like wealth and health, where he is conscious that sacrifices ought to be *offered* to his gods, *he* easily gives evidence of the above mentioned mentality; cf. Bh. Gīta 3,11: *devān bhāvayatānena, te devā bhāvayantu vaḥ parasparaṃ bhāvayantaḥ, śreyaḥ param avāpsyatha*. „By this foster ye the gods and let the gods foster you. Thus fostering each other you shall attain to the supreme good" [11]). The function of "to give" and "to receive" very often is based upon a relation of reciprocity.

11. The relationship of the *devas* and sacrifice.

It is a human custom to show one's submissiveness in the ritual token of sacrifice. The rendering of oneself, of one's daughters or sons, to the Māharājā, putting down one's pagri at the feet of the person offended or one's creditor, are even nowadays the very tokens of *one's deepest dependence on the person concerned. Immediately* we may draw the conclusion that by withdrawing some personal property from daily use, and to hand it over to some august personality, is no absolute proof for the divinity of the subject concerned. It is perhaps interesting to add that the creditor or māharājā or the offended person in such a case even nowadays is called: *Deva* as I found myself. However, if one relation is obvious, it is the connection between *devas* and offerings.

a) The *devas* have some contact with rites, and very often Agni is requested to carry the *devas* to the place of sacrifice, cf. 1,13,1: 2: 4: 14,12: 15,4: 5,11,2: 14,1: so other passages without number.

b) The *devas* themselves are time and again invited to the offerings to seat themselves upon the Barhis (sacrificial grass), *to eat from the* offerings and to drink the somadraught cf. 3,25,4: 5,51,3: *devān upa hvaye* cf. RV. 1,13,12: 44,4: 152,7: 186,1: [12]).

c) *Sacrificial offerings belong to the devas: they are their food.* cf. 4,15,2: 7,11,2: 1: 14,1: 10,70,2: 187,6: 11:.

d) The *devas* long for those offerings: cf. 1,12,4: 162,11: 187,6,11: 188,10: 2,37,6: 6,52,8: 7,82,7: etc.

e) They are invited to support the sacrifice: *yajñeṣu . . . īḷate* cf. 1,15,7: 3,8,8: 5,21,3: 4:. On this support the complete outcome and results depend. Here we may again see an indication of the magic conception. Moreover the *devas* themselves ought to give assistance for the required result by looking for the precise and correct performance of the sacrificial act: cf. 1,18,8:f

f) The *devas* are the objects of offering: *devān yaja:* "honour the *devas* with sacrifices" can be met with throughout the entire RV. cf. 1,15,12: 20,8: 163,13: 162,21: 2,41,20: 3,14,5: 5,5,11: 6,71,6:. Of course the *devas* have to accept the offerings cf. 1,139,11: *devāso yajñam imam juṣadhvam;* They eat the gift offered: *adanty āhutam* cf. 1,94,3:.

g) In short: the *devas* are worthy to receive sacrifices, or as Geldner translates: "opferberechtigt". We meet the following terms: *yajatra* and *yajata:* cf. 1,186,11: 2,29,6: 3,57,5: 7,75,7: 10,64,14: 93,3: Vāl. 9,1: also *yajñīya* cf. 1,16,2:[22]) and *yajatha* cf. 3,5,9:.

h) Another factor I could trace in some texts is that sacrifice has a power over the *devas* and they themselves are dependent on this sacrifice, and possibly this is the reason why sometimes the *devas offer to sacrifice* cf. 1,164,50: 10,90,16: 124,6: Geldner adds to 1,164,50: "Nach Sāyaṇa sind es die *karmadevāḥ* deren Erfolg auf Opfer usw. beruht, oder die Adityas und die Aṅgiras' heiszen die Sādhyagötter wofür er sich auf Ait. Br. 1,16,36—39: beruft." And Geldner renders *himself I, p. 236:* "Mit Opfer opferten die Götter dem Opfer. Dies waren die ersten Bräuche. Diese Mächte folgten in den Himmel nach, in dem die früheren Götter, die Sādhya's sich befinden."

i) At times one might almost believe, as we mentioned above, that the *devas* favour the sacrifice and are obedient to it; cf. 3,8,8: sajosaso *yajñam avantu:* "They must (imperative form) favour the sacrifice unanimously". It seems that in sacrificial performances the *devas* are powers to join and to do what they are requested to!

j) The best among all kinds of offering appears to be the soma beverage cf. 9,67,28: and the *invitations* to *somapītaye* are really numberless cf. 3,25,4: and 5,51,3:. This very *soma* is mentioned as a *deva* itself: *devo deveṣu ābhagaḥ;* cf. 1,136,4: 7,21,1: 9,3,9: 6,7: 42,2: 99,7: 103,6.

k) The sacrificial post is called [illegible] post is offering itself. The [illegible] as a victim is strengthened by the *devas* cf. 1,163,8: 9:. Yet, the *devas* themselves have great respect for this horse: "die Götter kamen zu dessen Opfermahl, der als erster das Rennpferd bestieg" (1,163,9:).

The Ghee, offered or yet to be offered, *is presented* to us as a *maha deva* cf. 4,58,3: So are the soma-pressing-stones: *ubhā devāv divaśca* [illegible] *rājathaḥ* cf. 5,38,3:. And in 8,90,16: we hear the cow named as *devī*. M. Muuster undertook special *research* on this topic of the holy

cow [14]). We hear Indra mentioned as a bull, Uṣas as a cow [15]) and the mother of cows as well. Also Aditi [16]), Iḍā and Pṛśni are thought of in the shape of a cow (o.c. p. 6). Interesting is the remark M. Muusses made (o.c. p. 15): "In de RV. was van heiligheid geen sprake, we vonden althans geen hymne, die aan een bepaalde vereerde godheid "koe" was gericht." (In RV. there is not a trace to be found of belief in the holiness of the cow. Anyhow we did not encounter any hymn, that was intended for a devī: "Cow"). And in short cf. 7,104,18: calls sacrifice itself a *deva* in general: *deve adhvare*. A short worthwhile remark is, that from the facts mentioned above it can be concluded, that various substances, even lifeless, can be named a *deva*. Lifeless at least in our ideas. It may be that the Vedic Indian regarded various "lifeless objects" as some embodiment of life itself and or as a manifestation of life's powers. So I dare not conclude that the Indian thought "any" lifeless objects a possible *deva*.

12. The *devas* are the objects of hymns and praises. And manifestly the Indians reveal their ideas that the *devas* found a pleasure in those praises; cf. 1,147,1: *ubhe yat toke tanaye dadhānā ṛtasya sāman raṇayanta devāḥ*, and 2,41,18: speaks of *juṣasva*. They are also fond of the rites and offerings, cf. 3,6,7: and Agni is called the one who cheers the *devas* up, cf. 3,5,5:.

In short: offerings and hymns are a power over the *devas*, cf. 6,51,8: *nama id ugraṃ nama ā vivāse namo dādhāra pṛthivīm uta dyām namo devebhyo nama īśa eṣām kṛtaṃ cid eno namasā vivāse*: "Die Anbetung (Geldner remarks: hier personifiziert) ist mächtig, die An-

Anbetung

Auch die

13. RV. 1,13,1: gives to a *deva* (i.e. Agni) the title of *ṛṣi*; cf. also 1,12,7: and elsewhere we read: 7,70,4: *yogyā aśnavaithe ṛṣiṇām* "ye strive after the practices of the *ṛṣis*." So 10,62,4: speaks of *devaputras* as *ṛṣis*. Elsewhere again we meet the title *kavi* with the names of *devas*, scarcely with *deva* as an apposition, cf. Agni 1,12,7: *kavim agnim upa stuhi*, and 1,76,5: as well. Varuṇa is the *kavitama deva* (5,85,6:) and in 7,86,7: Varuṇa *deva* . . . *kavitara*.

Kavi and *ṛṣi* both indicate lofty and august personalities. They are human beings, but stand in a contemplative contact with the supernatural sphere; and caught by heavenly inspiration they utter god-inspired words. The authors give their ideas about the *ṛṣis*. So H. von Glasenapp [17]) asserts that the *śruti* "geschaut (wurde) von weltentrückten Heiligen, von *ṛṣis* welche in stiller Andacht göttlicher Erkenntnis teilhaftig wurden" and Gonda, in his Inleiding tot het

Indische Denken [18]): "to those ṛṣis came the revelation of the eternal truth; and the godhead by way of inspiration reveals the divine facts to the seer and puts into formulas the Truth Divine, without creating it." Masson Oursel [19]), in Ancient India mentions the ṛṣis as the "mythical sages of prehistory" and (o.c. p. 129) relating to the śruti he asserts: "to indicate exactly how far they have objectivity they are said to have been "seen" by the first inspired bards, who accordingly are called ṛṣis "the seers" of hymns". Oldenberg in Religion des Veda [20]) recalls that the ṛṣis are the ancestors of the great Brahmanic families. "They are priests and they have brought law and order to the creatures after they took their seats in the sky." Oldenberg further states that they themselves are *no former devas or demons*, but adding that "they are nothing like natural power".

Logically reasoning their epithet can not hold true of God, but only of a being inferior to God. Yet, as so many terms, it can be nothing more than a comparison, they could indicate here: "a sublime and exalted person pronouncing superhuman truths".

14. Number of the *devas*.

A few passages show us Indra as *eko devaḥ:* cf. 1,32,12: 52,14: 10,104,9:. This *eka deva* must not be regarded as the "only one" with nobody next to him. But "Indra did it all by himself." So 3,46,2: names Indra: "Alleiniger König der ganzen Welt" cf. also 6,36,4:. Also Agni receives the very same adjective, cf. 1,145,3: 3,1,10: 8,58,2: and Aditi 1,89,10: but here we see Aditi shown as the only principle from which everything has been evolved and emanated, and no enthusiasm may allow us to render *eka deva* as the "only God". "Unique" is quite sufficient. For expressing that the *deva* is doing something all alone by himself, this is the *only* way of expression. Too often there are utterances about *janma* and *viśo devānām* [21]) for this expression to force us to accept an absconded monotheism or even a rudiment of the latter. Elsewhere we often observe that the *devas* are eleven in number, cf. 1,34,11: 139,11: and 3,6,9:. And again we meet the number 3339, cf. RV. 3,9,9:. Often the RV. speaks about the *viśve devāḥ*, over the *gaṇa* of the Maruts.

15. Order among the *devas*.

One can clearly discern a sort of order among the *devas* in RV. All *devas* do not have the same [illegible]
in age seems to be ad[illegible]
arbhakebhyo nama yu[illegible]
lakṣavānāṃ mā jyāya[illegible] *devāḥ*: Geldner translates: "Verneigung vor den Groszen. Verneigung vor den Kleinen. Verneigung vor den Jungen, Verneigungen vor den Betagten. Wir wollen die Götter verehren, wenn wir es vermögen. Nicht will ich die Rede eines

cow [14]). We hear Indra mentioned as a bull, Uṣas as a cow [15]) and the mother of cows as well. Also Aditi [16]), Iḍā and Pṛśni are thought of in the shape of a cow (o.c. p. 6). Interesting is the remark M. Muusses made (o.c. p. 15): "In de RV. was van heiligheid geen sprake, we vonden althans geen hymne, die aan een bepaalde vereerde godheid "koe" was gericht." (In RV. there is not a trace to be found of belief in the holiness of the cow. Anyhow we did not encounter any hymn, that was intended for a devī: "Cow"). And in short cf. 7,104,18: calls sacrifice itself a *deva* in general: *deve adhvare*. A short worthwhile remark is, that from the facts mentioned above it can be concluded, *that various substances, even lifeless, can be named a deva. Lifeless at* least in our ideas. It may be that the Vedic Indian regarded various "lifeless objects" as some embodiment of life itself and or as a manifestation of life's powers. So I dare not conclude that the Indian thought "any" lifeless objects a possible *deva*.

12. The *devas* are the objects of hymns and praises. And manifestly the Indians reveal their ideas that the *devas* found a pleasure in those praises; cf. 1,147,1: *ubhe yat toke tanaye dadhānā ṛtasya sāman raṇayanta devāḥ*, and 2,41,18: speaks of *juṣasva*. They are also fond of the rites and offerings, cf. 3,6,7: and Agni is called the one who *cheers the devas up*, *cf.* 3,5,5:.

In short: offerings and hymns are a power over the *devas*, cf. 6,51,8: *nama id ugraṃ nama ā vivāse namo dādhāra pṛthivīm uta dyām namo devebhyo nama īśa eṣāṃ kṛtaṃ cid eno namasā vivāse:* "Die Anbetung (Geldner remarks: hier personifiziert) ist mächtig, die Anbetung bitte ich her. Die Anbetung erhält Erde und Himmel. Anbetung gebührt den Göttern, die Anbetung hat über sie Macht. Auch die getane Sünde bitte ich durch Anbetung ab."

13. RV. 1,13,1: gives to a *deva* (i.e. Agni) the title of *ṛṣi*; cf. also 1,12,7: and elsewhere we read: 7,70,4: *yogyā aśnavaithe ṛṣīṇām* "ye strive after the practices of the *ṛṣis*." So 10,62,4: speaks of *devaputras* as *ṛṣis*. Elsewhere again we meet the title *kavi* with the names of *devas*, scarcely with *deva* as an apposition, cf. Agni 1,12,7: *kavim agnim upa stuhi*, and 1,76,5: as well. Varuṇa is the *kavitama deva* (5,85,6:) and in 7,86,7: Varuṇa *deva* . . . *kavitara*.

Kavi and *ṛṣi* both indicate lofty and august personalities. They are human beings, but stand in a contemplative contact with the supernatural sphere; and caught by heavenly inspiration they utter god-inspired words. The authors give their ideas about the *ṛṣis*. So H. von Glasenapp [17]) asserts that the *śruti* "geschaut (wurde) von weltentrückten Heiligen, von ṛṣis welche in stiller Andacht göttlicher Erkenntnis teilhaftig wurden" and Gonda, in his Inleiding tot het

Indische Denken[28]): "to those ṛṣis came the revelation of the eternal truth; and the godhead by way of inspiration reveals the divine facts to the seer and puts into formulas the Truth Divine, without creating it." Masson Oursel[29]), in Ancient India mentions the *ṛṣis* as the "mythical sages of prehistory" and (o.c. p. 129) relating to the *śruti* he asserts: "to indicate exactly how far they have objectivity they are said to have been "seen" by the first inspired bards, who accordingly are called *ṛṣis* "the seers" of hymns". Oldenberg in Religion des Veda[30]) recalls that the ṛṣis are the ancestors of the great Brahmanic families. "They are priests and they have brought law and order to the creatures after they took their seats in the sky." Oldenberg further states that they themselves are no former devas or demons, but adding that "they are nothing like natural power".

Logically reasoning their epithet can not hold true of God, but only of a being inferior to God. Yet, as so many terms, it can be nothing more than a comparison, they could indicate here: "a sublime and exalted person pronouncing superhuman truths".

14. Number of the *devas*.

A few passages show us Indra as *eko devaḥ*: cf. 1,32,12: 52,14: 10,104,9:. This *eka deva* must not be regarded as the "only one" with nobody next to him. But "Indra did it all by himself." So 3,46,2: names Indra: "Alleiniger König der ganzen Welt" cf. also 6,36,4:. Also Agni receives the very same adjective, cf. 1,145,3: 3,1,10: 8,58,2: and Aditi 1,89,10: but here we see Aditi shown as the only principle from which everything has been evolved and emanated, and no enthusiasm may allow us to render *eka deva* as the "only God". "Unique" is quite sufficient. For expressing that the *deva* is doing something all alone by himself, this is the only way of expression. Too often there are utterances about *janma* and *viśo devānām*[31]) for this expression to force us to accept an absconded monotheism or even a rudiment of the latter. Elsewhere we often observe that the *devas* are eleven in number, cf. 1,34,11: 139,11: and 3,6,9:. And again we meet the number 3339, cf. RV. 3,9,9:. Often the RV. speaks about the *viśve devāḥ*, over the *gaṇa* of the Maruts.

15. Order among the *devas*.

One can clearly discern a sort of *order* among the *devas* in RV. All *devas* do not have the same position cf. 1,27,13: where disparity in age seems to be admitted among them. *Namo mahadbhyo, namo arbhakebhyo namo yuvabhyo nama āśinebhyaḥ. Yajāma devān yadi śaknavāma mā jyāyasaḥ śaṃsam ā vṛkṣi devāḥ*: Geldner translates: "Verneigung vor den Groszen. Verneigung vor den Kleinen. Verneigung vor den Jungen, Verneigungen vor den Betagten. Wir wollen die Götter verehren, wenn wir es vermögen. Nicht will ich die Rede eines

cow [14]). We hear Indra mentioned as a bull, Uṣas as a cow [15]) and the mother of cows as well. Also Aditi [16]), Iḍā and Pṛśni are thought of in the shape of a cow (o.c. p. 6). Interesting is the remark M. Muusses made (o.c. p. 15): "In de RV. was van heiligheid geen sprake, we vonden althans geen hymne, die aan een bepaalde vereerde godheid "koe" was gericht." (In RV. there is not a trace to be found of belief in the holiness of the cow. Anyhow we did not encounter any hymn, that was intended for a devī: "Cow"). And in short cf. 7,104,18: calls sacrifice itself a *deva* in general: *deve adhvare.* A short worthwhile remark is, that from the facts mentioned above it can be concluded, that various substances, even lifeless, can be named a *deva.* Lifeless at least in our ideas. It may be that the Vedic Indian regarded various "lifeless objects" as some embodiment of life itself and or as a manifestation of life's powers. So I dare not conclude that the Indian thought "any" lifeless objects a possible *deva.*

12. The *devas* are the objects of hymns and praises. And manifestly the Indians reveal their ideas that the *devas* found a pleasure in those praises; cf. 1,147,1: *ubhe yat toke tanaye dadhānā ṛtasya sāman raṇayanta devāḥ,* and 2,41,18: speaks of *juṣasva.* They are also fond of the rites and offerings, cf. 3,6,7: and Agni is called the one who cheers the *devas* up, cf. 3,5,5:.

In short: offerings and hymns are a power over the *devas*, cf. 6,51,8: *nama id ugraṃ nama ā vivāse namo dādhāra pṛthivīm uta dyām namo devebhyo nama īśa eṣām kṛtaṃ cid eno namasā vivāse:* "Die Anbetung (Geldner remarks: hier personifiziert) ist mächtig, die Anbetung bitte ich her. Die Anbetung erhält Erde und Himmel. Anbetung gebührt den Göttern, die Anbetung hat über sie Macht. Auch die getane Sünde bitte ich durch Anbetung ab."

13. RV. 1,13,1: gives to a *deva* (i.e. Agni) the title of *ṛṣi;* cf. also 1,12,7: and elsewhere we read: 7,70,4: *yogyā aśnavaithe ṛṣiṇām* "ye strive after the practices of the *ṛṣis.*" So 10,62,4: speaks of *devaputras* as *ṛṣis.* Elsewhere again we meet the title *kavi* with the names of *devas,* scarcely with *deva* as an apposition, cf. Agni 1,12,7: *kavim agnim upa stuhi,* and 1,76,5: as well. Varuṇa is the *kavitama deva* (5,85,6:) and in 7,86,7: Varuṇa *deva . . . kavitara.*

Kavi and *ṛṣi* both indicate lofty and august personalities. They are human beings, but stand in a contemplative contact with the supernatural sphere; and caught by heavenly inspiration they utter god-inspired words. The authors give their ideas about the *ṛṣis.* So H. von Glasenapp [17]) asserts that the *śruti* "geschaut (wurde) von weltentrückten Heiligen, von ṛṣis welche in stiller Andacht göttlicher Erkenntnis teilhaftig wurden" and Gonda, in his Inleiding tot het

Indische Denken[19]): "to those *ṛṣis* came the revelation of the eternal truth; and the godhead by way of inspiration reveals the divine facts to the seer and puts into formulas the Truth Divine, without creating it." Masson Oursel[19]), in Ancient India mentions the *ṛṣis* as the "mythical sages of prehistory" and (o.c. p. 129) relating to the *śruti* he asserts: "to indicate exactly how far they have objectivity they are said to have been "seen" by the first inspired bards, who accordingly are called *ṛṣis* "the seers" of hymns". Oldenberg in Religion des Veda[20]) recalls that the *ṛṣis* are the ancestors of the great Brahmanic families. "They are priests and they have brought law and order to the creatures after they took their seats in the sky." Oldenberg further states that they themselves are *no* former devas or demons, but adding that "they are nothing like natural power".

Logically reasoning their epithet can not hold true of God, but only of a being inferior to God. Yet, as so many terms, it can be nothing more than a comparison, they could indicate here: "a sublime and exalted person pronouncing superhuman truths".

14. Number of the *devas.*

A few passages show us Indra as *eko devaḥ:* cf. 1,32,12: 52,14: 10,104,9:. This *eka deva* must not be regarded as the "only one" with nobody next to him. But "Indra did it all by himself." So 3,46,2: names Indra: "Alleiniger König der ganzen Welt" cf. also 6,36,4:. Also Agni receives the very same adjective, cf. 1,145,3: 3,1,10: 8,58,2: and Aditi 1,89,10: but here we see Aditi shown as the only principle from which everything has been evolved and emanated, and no enthusiasm may allow us to render *eka deva* as the "only God". "Unique" is quite sufficient. For expressing that the *deva* is doing something all alone by himself, this is the only way of expression. Too often there are utterances about *janma* and *viśo devānām*[21]) for this expression to force us to accept an absconded monotheism or even a rudiment of the latter. Elsewhere we often observe that the *devas* are [illegible]
again we meet [illegible]
about the *viśve* [illegible]

15. Order among the *devas.*

One can clearly discern a sort of order among the *devas* in RV. All *devas* do not have the same position cf. 1,27,13: where disparity in age seems to be admitted among them. *Namo mahadbhyo, namo arbhakebhyo namo yuvabhyo nama āśinebhyaḥ. Yajāma devān yadi śaknavāma mā jyāyasaḥ śamsam ā vṛkṣi devāḥ:* Geldner translates: "Verneigung vor den Groszen. Verneigung vor den Kleinen. Verneigung vor den Jungen, Verneigungen vor den Betagten. Wir wollen die Götter verehren, wenn wir es vermögen. Nicht will ich die Rede eines

Höheren vorwegnehmen, ihr Götter." In 5,26,1: Agni is the one who has to bring the *devas* to the place of sacrifice. Does this imply, that in one way or the other a lower grade for Agni had been reserved? However, it is rather difficult to report correctly the several concepts in this matter.

a) Generally speaking we notice Indra being praised and magnified by the other *devas* as their hero, their champion, but this does not imply that he is their chieftain cf. 1,52,15: *devāso amadann anu tvā* cf. also 1,102,1 and 103,7. But certainly it does imply that he is superior to them.

b) Indra is named the highest: *na tvāvāñ anyo astīndra, devo na martyo jyāyān* cf. 6,30,4: and also 3,46,3: 4,30,1: 3:.

c) But he has not received this prerogative quite alone 1,131,1: suggest *devāso dadhire puraḥ*: "the devas appointed him as their chief." 2,13,5: even suggest that they had begot him *adhākṛṇoḥ pṛthivīṃ saṃdṛśe dive yo dhautīnām ahihann āriṇak pathaḥ: taṃ tvā stomebhir udabhir na vājinaṃ devaṃ devā ajanant sāsy ukthyaḥ*; cf. Geldner: "Dann lieszest du die Erde den Himmel schauen, der du, o Drachentöter, die Bahnen der Flüsse freimachtest. Dich den Gott haben die Götter mit Lobliedern wie ein Rennpferd mit Wasser neugeboren. Darum bist du preisenswert". Geldner however in his 2nd edition gives this translation for *ajanant;* the first edition renders "ermuntert". After "neugeboren" he puts a question mark, and in a note he suggests: *ajanan* paszt nicht recht: ob *ajunan (jū)* "regten an"?

d) His huge and prominent power, ranging above everything, Indra received from the *devas* cf. 1,80,15: *nahi nu yād adhīmasīndraṃ ko vīryā paraḥ. tasmin nṛmṇam uta kratuṃ devā ojāṃsi saṃ dadhur arcann, anu svarājyam*, which Geldner renders: "Denn niemals soweit wir gedenken war einer an Manneskraft höher als Indra. In ihm haben die Götter Mannesmut und Einsicht und alle Kräfte vereinigt. Sie sollen in deine Selbstherrlichkeit einstimmen"; cf. also 6,20,2: 25,8:.

e) Human beings worship Indra as the *deveṣu prathamam* (1,102,9:). That is why the first draught of Soma has been reserved for him (1,135,1:) and he is named *Somo deveṣu* (id. 2); this is something very sublime according to Indian ideas.

f) The *devas* are good friends of Indra.

Cf. 3,47,3: Indra has been appointed as their chief by them (1,131,1), but at the same time (1,68,2:) it is reported: *pari yad eṣām eko viśveṣām bhuvad devo devānām mahitvā*: "that he (Indra) alone surpasses by his majesty all the devas, he the deva". However, RV.

says the same of Agni, yet in a different wording: 5,25,4: *Agnir deveṣu rājati ... marteṣu*: "Agni governs *devas* and mortals". Agni is called *prathama ... amṛtānām*: "the first of immortals", cf. 1,24,2:, and 10,70,2: presents Agni as a priest and at the very same time: *devatamaḥ*: "one who is *deva* at its utmost". We hear the same mentioned about Bṛhaspati in 2,24,3: *devānām devatamāya*. The one who reveres him, is the favourite of the *devas*. cf. 2,25,5: Mitra and Varuṇa have received the prerogative of *devā deveṣu praśastā*: "both these *devas* are respected by the *devas*." (5,68,2: 3:) and 3rd stanza: "great is their power among the *devas*". And 6,67,10: tells us that they do not discuss might and power with the *devas* implicitly: they are far superior to them. The combination Indra-Varuṇa is named as exalted above all other *devas* (6,68,4:) and 5,67,1: says about Mitra-Varuṇa: *varṣiṣṭham kṣatram āśāthe*: "you reached the highest point of authority". The entire 67th sūkta of maṇḍala 5 gives evidence of this. Occasionally Soma is praised as *pari devebhyas* cf. 9,42,2: 65,2: and also 6,48,19: where we hear Pūṣan adored as *paro hi martyair asi samo devaiḥ*. Yet, in 6,58,4: it does appear that the other *devas* have control over Pūṣan: *devāso adaduḥ sūryāyai*: "Er (Pūṣan) den die Götter der Sūryā gegeben haben."

Atkin's book Pūṣan in the Rig Veda [32]) gives a detailed description of Pūṣan. It is worth quoting: "Originally he (Pūṣan) seems to have been the solar deity of a pastoral people, consequently a deity with pastoral characteristics and functions of a god of paths, all inherent in his nature and developing more or less contemporaneously". He adds some secondary traits as "guiding the souls to heaven", "guide for the marriage rites and distributor of wealth". Finally, 9,100,6: makes a discrimination between Indra-Viṣṇu and the other *devas*.

16. *Amṛtya* and the like are the next epithets frequently used in connexion with the *devas*.

First: the meaning of this concept. P. Thieme published a paper about it [33]). *He expounds* the linguistic relations of *amṛta* (n.) as "Leben, Lebenskraft" rather than "Unsterblichkeit" i.e. Life, Vitality, rather than Immortality, as the Greek ambrosios and ambroton (o.c., p. 52). He quotes RV. 1,23,19: *apsu antar amṛtam apsu bheṣajam*: "in the water is vitality, in the waters is healing Power". Yet, *his* paper does not explain the *subject* as well as Prof. Gonda: „amṛta is not in the hands or the *power of death*; possessing vitality and this in a special or uncommon quantity!" [34]) *Thieme (o.c., p. 24)* renders *amṛta* as "Lebenskraft spendend", cf. RV. 9,74,6: *haviḥ ... amṛtam* "Lebenskraft spendende Opferspeise" and *jyotir amṛtam* is "lebenskraftspendendes Licht" (7,76,1:). One could almost believe that he proves this rendering best in 1,159,2: *suretasā pitarā bhūma*

cakratur uru prajāyā amṛtaṃ varīmabhiḥ. "Die Eltern von gutem Samen machten die Erde breit zur Fortzeugung, Lebenskraft spendend mittels ihrer Breite." On p. 26 of the same work, he proposes to render *amṛtatva* with "Nicht-tot-sein, Leben" cf. 10,107,2: *Amṛtatvam bhajante ... pra tiranta āyuḥ:* "Sie haben Teil am Leben ..., sie setzten (glücklich) über die Lebenszeit hinweg" and he ascertains p. 29 that Vedic *amṛta* n. is "Lebenskraft", *amṛta* is "Lebenskraft spendend" and *amṛtatva* "Lebenskraft". They relate themselves to quite natural subjects. Yet, because of their healing effects they are ascribed to heavenly sources. His examples are quite convincing in my opinion: *goṣu priyam amṛtam* (RV. 1,71,9:) milk is called: the "kind vitality in the cows", so 6,37,3: of the wind; 7,76,1: of light; 5,63,2: of rain, and in 1,23,19: 10,107,2: the pious share in natural vitality. But where *amṛta* or *amṛtatva* will be translated either by "immortal" (which also means "not in the power of death") or "vital", none is exclusively of the *devas.* Praising the *devas* as *amṛta,* it does not mean that they are qualified as divine in sensu stricto.

We find this concept joined to the *devas* cf. 1,58,1: and also 2,1,14:, as well as with certain names of *devas,* e.g. with Agni 1,44,1: 3,27,7: 29,13: 20,3: 4,3,3: 5,18,1: 2: 14,1: 2: 10,21,4: to heaven-and-earth 1,185,6: to Indra 1,129,10: to Pūṣan 8,4,18:.

We state another nuance where it is mentioned: *martyeṣv amṛta* cf. 1,77,1: 4,1,1: 2,1:. It might be a hyperbolic expression: *kathā dāśemāgnaye, kāsmai devajuṣṭocyate bhāmine gīḥ; yo martyeṣu amṛta ṛtāvā hotā yajiṣṭha it kṛṇoti devān:* "wie sollen wir dem Agni opfern, welche Lobrede wird dem Strahlenden als gottgefällig vorgetragen? Der, der Unsterbliche unter den Sterblichen als rechtmässiger, bestopfernder Horr die Götter gewinnt" (1,77,1: cf. also 3,20,3:).

This *amṛtatva* is considered an acquired quality for the *devas* cf. 4,35,8: 36,4: and Indra is according to 6,44,15: the prominent drinker of the *Soma.* Moreover *soma* and *amṛta* are like synonyms, and the *amṛta* becomes the draught of immortality i.e. vitality. During my own research, while looking through narrowly those passages, there arose the problem whether *deva amṛta* is to be rendered as "immortal deva"; I surmised that the true contents had a more analogical meaning: "having a greater vitality than the mortals". Especially as it has been applied so freely that one has to consider it in a freer sense e.g. 1,30,18: *rathas ... amṛtyaḥ ...* cf. also 5,75,9:.

17. *Asura* as an epithet to the *devas.*

Grassmann, who though of the 19th century, is still of some historical value, gives the following analysis of the concept of *asura* in his Dict. on RV. p. 155: "*a.* lebendig, regsam; aber nur vom körperlosen,

geistigen Leben gebraucht und häufig mit Bezeichnungen der Weisheit (pracetas) verbunden. Also 1) geistig lebendig und in substantivischem Sinne: Geist, Gott, von Göttern überhaupt. 2) von einzelnen Göttern. [illegible]

[illegible]

Götter und besonders die Aditya's erscheinen. 4) himmlisch, göttlich, von dem Gebetsrufe, der zum Himmel dringt, schmeichelnd, von den Opfergebern, die die Sänger reich beschenkten, vom Geiste des gestorbenen Vaters. 5) Bezeichnung eines obersten bösen Geistes als dessen Mannen (vīrās) die Dämonen erscheinen. 6) Bezeichnung böser Geister überhaupt." Monier Williams o.c. p. 106: Ved. living, alive, spiritual; an epithet of the Supreme Spirit; Varuṇa; incorporeal, superhuman, divine; m. Spirit, an incorporeal being of an evil kind; an evil spirit, a demon, a ghost or spectre etc.". Stchoupak, Nitti and Renou in their dictionary: "mauvais esprit, ennemi des dieux, démon, pl.n. d'une classe de démons; Rāhu."

The first two authors think *asura* as a term for "something strictly spiritual"; an indication of God in sensu stricto. 1,24,14: presents King Varuṇa to us as: "einsichtsvoller Asura" (Geldner). Thus of Savitar 1,35,10: *Asura* with a golden hand; cf. also 1,151,4: 2,27,10: 28,7:. So Geldner certainly does not give any precise rendering of *asura*. It is a pity that Lüders did not devote a chapter or at least a paragraph to this term in his book: Varuṇa I. We see 2,27,4: that the Adityas preserve their *asura*-dignity, and in the same stanza we come across the fact that the Adityas are called *devas* and *asuras* as well. And stanza 10: *tvaṃ viśveṣāṃ varuṇāsi rājā ye ca devā asura ye ca martāḥ*. Which Geldner renders: "Du, Varuṇa, bist König über alle: über Götter, o Asura, und die Sterblichen." *Asura* as epithet to *deva* occurs unfrequently e.g. 3,55,1: (*devānām asuratvam.*) This certainly points out that the Vedic Indian considered the [illegible]

[illegible] des göttlichen Waltens werden in allerlei seltsame Allegorien und Paradoxen gekleidet. Die Gottheit selbst musz erraten werden". 7,65,2: shows to us Mitra Varuṇa as both *asura* and the lords of the *devas*. *Asura* seems to be superior to *deva*. 8,25,4: expresses that Mitra-Varuṇa are devas *and* asuras: *devāv asurā ṛtāvānāv ṛtam ā ghoṣato bṛhat*. And 10,82,5: searching for the principle of the Universe "was jenseits des Himmels, noch jenseits der Erde, jenseits der Götter (*devebhis*), des Asura's ist, was war das denn was das Wasser als ersten Keim empfing worin alle Götter (*devāḥ*) miteingerechnet waren." Here *asura* and *deva* are

cakratur uru prajāyā amṛtaṃ varīmabhiḥ. "Die Eltern von gutem Samen machten die Erde breit zur Fortzeugung, Lebenskraft spendend mittels ihrer Breite." On p. 26 of the same work, he proposes to render *amṛtatva* with "Nicht-tot-sein, Leben" cf. 10,107,2: *Amṛtatvam bhajante ... pra tiranta āyuḥ:* "Sie haben Teil am Leben ... sie setzten (glücklich) über die Lebenszeit hinweg" and he ascertains p. 29 that Vedic *amṛta* n. is "Lebenskraft", *amṛta* is "Lebenskraft spendend" and *amṛtatva* "Lebenskraft". They relate themselves to quite natural subjects. Yet, because of their healing effects they are ascribed to heavenly sources. His examples are quite convincing in my opinion: *goṣu priyam amṛtam* (RV. 1,71,9:) milk is called: the "kind vitality in the cows", so 6,37,3: of the wind; 7,76,1: of light; 5,63,2: of rain, and in 1,23,19: 10,107,2: the pious share in natural vitality. But where *amṛta* or *amṛtatva* will be translated either by "immortal" (which also means "not in the power of death") or "vital", none is exclusively of the *devas*. Praising the *devas* as *amṛta*, it does *not mean that they are qualified as divine in sensu* stricto.

We find this concept joined to the *devas* cf. 1,58,1: and also 2,1,14:, as well as with certain names of *devas*, e.g. with Agni 1,44,1: 3,27,7: 29,13: 20,3: 4,3,3: 5,18,1: 2: 14,1: 2: 10,21,4: to heaven-and-earth 1,185,6: *to* Indra 1,129,10: *to* Pūṣan 8,4,18:.

We state another nuance where it is mentioned: *martyeṣv amṛta* cf. 1,77,1: 4,1,1: 2,1:. It might be a hyperbolic expression: *kathā dāśemāgnaye, kāsmai devajuṣṭocyate bhāmine gīḥ; yo martyeṣu amṛta ṛtāvā hotā yajiṣṭha it kṛṇoti devān:* "wie sollen wir dem Agni opfern, welche Lobrede wird dem Strahlenden als gottgefällig vorgetragen? Der, der Unsterbliche unter den Sterblichen als rechtmäsziger, bestopfernder Hotṛ die Götter gewinnt" (1,77,1: cf. also 3,20,3:).

This *amṛtatva* is considered an acquired quality for the *devas* cf. 4,35,8: 36,4: and Indra is according to 6,44,15: the prominent drinker of the *Soma*. Moreover *soma* and *amṛta* are like synonyms, and the *amṛta* becomes the draught of immortality i.e. vitality. During my own research, while looking through narrowly those passages, there arose the *problem* whether *deva amṛta is to be rendered as* "immortal deva"; I surmised that the true contents had a more analogical meaning: "having a greater vitality than the mortals". Especially as it has been applied so freely that one has to consider it in a freer sense e.g. 1,30,18: *rathas ... amṛtyaḥ ...* cf. also 5,75,9:.

17. *Asura* as an epithet to the *devas*.

Grassmann, who though of the 19th century, is still of some historical value, gives the following analysis of the concept of *asura* in his Dict. on RV. p. 155: "*a.* lebendig, regsam; aber nur vom körperlosen,

power, it surely indicates that the element of light belongs to *asuratva* cf. 5,85,:. It is quite important that Varuṇa is so often connected with creative power and creation, *māyā* (which Geldner translates as "Kunststück". We shalle have to return to it) and that light usually is connected with Dyaus, Aditi, Agni, Savitṛ. (Sometimes also with Soma, Rudra, Pūṣan) and that creation and light seem again to be related to the personality Dyauspitar, who has the title of *asura* as well. We could come near this problem also from another side. In 8,25,1: one feels that *deva* is inferior to Mitra-Varuṇa, *asura* par excellence. And 8,25,4: shows *deva* as one out of a great number of titles given to Mitra-Varuṇa. In the 10th maṇḍala 85,17: we find *devebhyaḥ* beside Sūrya, Mitra-Varuṇa and in 110,4: side by side with [illegible]

[illegible]

are clearly separated from them.

18. The *Vrata devānām*.

Monier-Williams circumscribes *vrata* as: "realm, sphere, sway (Ved.); rite, observance, practice; any religious act or obligation, enjoined by the gods; a sacrifice; a self-chosen voluntary act, any meritorious act of devotion or austerity, fasting, continence, vowed observance, vow." (o.c., p. 984).

And Stchoupak, Nitti, Renou (o.c. p. 711) "règle, observance, conduite, manière d'être: voeu (qu'on prononce), devoir religieux, pratique religieuse, chasteté."

Grassmann (o.c. p. 1361) translates: „1) der göttliche Wille, die göttliche Ordnung, Gesetz, Gebot," and Geldner in his translation of the RV. accepts this rendering by Grassmann. So we may say about the *vrata devānām:*

1) that they are sometimes to be regarded as law: cf. Geldner "das hohe Gesetz" 1,75,5: and also 3,56,1: 7,76,5; ("Gebote") 10,2,4 ("Gebote") 10,33,9: ("Gesetze") and Geldner renders *vrata* in 3,55,1: with "der Dienst" (the service). They are called *dhruva*: "solidly grounded, unshakable".

2) They are made by the *devas* themselves: *viśva . . . vratā dhruvā yāni devā akṛṇvata*, cf. 1,36,5:.

3) The *devas* keep an eye on their observance: they keep watch over their regulations and orders (cf. 1,31,2:). Agni guards them: (*Agne*) *devānām pari bhūṣasi vratam* cf. also 1,36,5: where Agni contains every law and rule given by the *devas*. And in 1,22,19: Viṣṇu receives the title of "guardian of the *vrata*".

opposites, like heaven and earth. And the passage 10,55,4: says Uṣas to be the giver of light, the only great *asura* power she has. Would that indicate that we have to render *asuratva* as "creative power"? 10,99,2: Indra is seated on the throne with "seiner *Asura*-würde".

There is an essential difference between *deva* and *asura* and it proves itself in 7,66,2: where Mitra-Varuṇa are said to have destined the *devas* to the dignity of *asura*. *Asuratva* is superior to *deva*.

Elsewhere 5,42,1: mentions Varuṇa, Bhāga, Aditi as *asura* but does not say a word about their *deva*-hood. 5,42,11: we hear Rudra being praised as *devam asuram*. 2,27,4: states the *devas* as provided with *asuryam: devā . . . rakṣamānā asuryam*, but st. 10 lauded Varuṇa the great as the Ruler over everything, *devas* included: *tvaṃ viśveṣām varuṇāsi rājā ye ca devā asura ye ca martāḥ śataṃ no rāsva śarado vicakṣe śyāmāyūṃsi sudhitāni pūrvā*. "Varuna, thou art king over all, even over the *devas*, O *asura*, and over the mortals as well. Grant us a hundred autumns . . . and may we reach the former . . . age." The context shows us Varuṇa as Universal Ruler, moreover he has power over Life. He is able to lengthen the same. And so it may indicate his creative power. 8,101,12: shows us Sūrya as the great preeminent one: *mahnā devānām asuryaḥ purohito vibhu jyotir adābhyam*. Indra in 6,36,1: *yad deveṣu dhārayathā asuryam*: "who thou wert appointed to *asura*-ship among the *devas*". P. von Bradke in Dyaus Asura, Ahura etc., p. 29 notices that it might be rendered as: "pouvoir suprême, souveraineté universelle" and he remarks quite interestingly that *asura* occurs 72 times in the singular, but only thrice in dual, and 10 times in plural (cf. o.c., p. 19). Again 4,42,2: presents Varuṇa saying: *ahaṃ rājā varuṇo mahyaṃ tāny asurāṇi prathamā dhārayanta, kratuṃ sacante varuṇasya devā rājāmi kṛṣṭer upamasya vavreh*. "Ich Varuṇa bin der König, mir waren zuerst die Asurawürden bestimmt. Des Varuṇa Rat befolgen die *Götter, ich herrsche über das Volk von höchster Kör*perform", (Geldner) and P. von Bradke renders: "für mich halten (die devas) jene uralten Attribute des höchsten Herrschers aufrecht". Certainly von Bradke considers the title of *asura* as a description of the one true God. Hopkins' criticism in Religions of India [23]) says: "Von Bradke's attempt has failed signally". My own opinion is that von Bradke's conclusion is more his pious wish than a proved thesis. But reading Hopkins' book one is struck by his deadly fear for any sign of monotheism, and *I believe, all be it unwillingly, that he does not* like to admit the idea of one true God in the RV.

Concluding one feels tempted to consider *asura* and *asuratva* as superior to *deva*; since there is presumably some relation to creative

power, it surely indicates that the element of light belongs to *asuratva* cf. 5,85,:. It is quite important that Varuṇa is so often connected with creative power and creation, *māyā* (which Geldner translates as "Kunststück". We shalle have to return to it) and that light usually is connected with Dyaus, Aditi, Agni, Savitṛ. (Sometimes also with Soma, Rudra, Pūṣan) and that creation and light seem again to be related to the personality Dyauspitar, who has the title of *asura* as well. We could come near this problem also from another side. In 8,25,1: one feels that *deva* is inferior to Mitra-Varuṇa, *asura* par excellence. And 8,25,4: shows *deva* as one out of a great number of titles given to Mitra-Varuṇa. In the 10th maṇḍala 85,17: we find *devebhyaḥ* beside Sūrya, Mitra-Varuṇa and in 110,4: side by side with [illegible]

are clearly separated from them.

18. The *Vrata devānām.*

Monier-Williams circumscribes *vrata* as: "realm, sphere, sway (Ved.); rite, observance, practice; any religious act or obligation, enjoined by the gods; a sacrifice; a self-chosen voluntary act, any meritorious act of devotion or austerity, fasting, continence, vowed observance, vow." (o.c., p. 984).

And Stchoupak, Nitti, Renou (o.c. p. 711) "règle, observance, conduite, manière d'être: voeu (qu'on prononce), devoir religieux, pratique religieuse, chasteté."

Grassmann (o.c. p. 1361) translates: „1) der göttliche Wille, die göttliche Ordnung, Gesetz, Gebot," and Geldner in his translation of the RV. accepts this rendering by Grassmann. So we may say about the *vrata devānām:*

1) that they are sometimes to be regarded as law: cf. Geldner "das hohe Gesetz" 1,75,5: and also 3,56,1: 7,76,5; ("Gebote") 10,2,4 ("Gebote") 10,33,9: ("Gesetze") and Geldner renders *vrata* in 3,55,1: with "der Dienst" (the service). They are called *dhruva*: "solidly grounded, unshakable".

2) They are made by the *devas* themselves: *viśva* . . . *vratā dhruvā yāni devā akṛṇvata*, cf. 1,36,5:.

3) The *devas* keep an eye on their observance: they keep watch over their regulations and orders (cf. 1,31,2:). Agni guards them: (*Agne*) *devānām pari bhūṣasi vratam* cf. also 1,36,5: where Agni contains every law and rule given by the *devas*. And in 1,22,19: Viṣṇu receives the title of "guardian of the *vrata*".

4) Especially the Adityas have a close relation to the *vrata devānām*, also Indra and Savitr. In 6,68,9: the mighty ruler is revealed as Varuṇa: *mahinā mahivrataḥ*, which Geldner renders: "Er der mit Macht mächtig Gebietende" ... and also: *ya urvī ... vibhāti*: "who as *mahivrataḥ* shines his light through the Universe".

19. The *devas* are the rulers of the Universe.
This quality is of the greatest importance. Certainly it has been revealed implicitly in 18 about the *vrata devānām*, but quite explicitly we hear that they are:

a) Creators or begetters of Agni in whom heaven and earth rest and who rule both worlds cf. 1,59,2:. Also 2,40,1: where Soma and Pūṣan are mentioned as procreators of the world. Worth noting is: Agni governs this world and the *devas* beget this *deva* Agni; cf. 1,59,2:.

b) The Adityas and Savitr are the rulers of the Universe. Then they are the leaders of mankind (1,90,1:) *Varuṇo Mitro ... devaiḥ sajoṣāḥ* "unanimously together with the *devas*". They show us the right path (1,169,5:). They protect this world: *viśvasya bhuvanasya gopāḥ*; cf. 2,27,4: and also 2,38,2: 4:. Some *devas* are the kings of all nations *samrājam* cf. 3,10,1 (Agni) and 5,68,2: 6,68,9: 8,25,4:. Indra is called a chieftain of the clan *viśpati* cf. 3,40,3: and Soma: *sahasrajit* 9,80,4:. There are expressions like *rājā kṛṣṭinām* (4,17,5:) Indra, or *rājā devaḥ* (Soma 9,108,8:) as well as *viśvasya gopā* "Guardians of the Universe" to Mitra-Varuṇa (8,25,1:).

And again in 9,86,30: Soma is praised as: "all worlds are under thou" and hymn 4,53 lauds *deva* Savitr as *asura*, as the great governor of heaven and earth. From him emanates authority and he keeps an eye on every law and any being; he commands the Universe and grants offspring.

c) The *devas* also stand for restoration of the disturbed order either physical or moral. It is therefore that one prays to them for forgiveness, e.g. 1,25,1 ff. is a hymn to invoke pardon of god; cf also 2,29: and 5,85,8:. And almost always it is Varuṇa who pardons the human beings.

Their will for redress expresses itself by their institution of punishments cf. 1,190,5: (Bṛhaspati) and 2,29,5: where Mitra-Varuṇa, Aditi, Indra and the Maruts are the avengers of the law.

20. The *devas* are *satyadharmāṇaḥ*.
According to Grassmann (o.c., p. 1453) it means: "whose laws are valid". M. Williams (o.c., p. 1053:) Ved. "practising the duty of truth and virtue". And I should like to suggest: "whose rule of life is in accord with the law of truth and reality". We meet this term with Agni: 1,12,7: 5,51,2: with Mitra-Varuṇa 5,63,1: and Savitṛ 10,34,8: 139,3:. 10,121,9: gives this *satyadharmāṇaḥ* as epithet to the Supreme Being "with valid laws" (Geldner renders: "mit gültigen Gesetzen"). A few words about the most important [illegible]

[illegible] and also for nature, animals, and *devas*. Even the *devas* have their rules proceeding from, and being manifestations or emanations of, eternally and generally valid standards and laws". So Gonda proceeds: "between law and order in the macrocosmos and on the other hand ethical, as well as social and juridical rules, there is not to be made any essential distinction. Every human being strives after a state of life wherein he is exempted from joy and distress, if the person concerned is a good species of mankind. Well then", the author continues, "the complete and perfect dharma consists of that steady stability that grants him this complete satisfaction and happiness". Personally I for one have a vague feeling that *dharma* is the subjective aspect of the objective law and eternal order: *ṛta*.

21. The power of the *devas* over life and death.
A good number of passages show us that the powers of the *devas* extend to life and death.

a) We meet such phrases as *āyur devahitam*: "the range of life ordered by the devas", cf. also 10,170,1: ("Er hat die Geschöpfe zum Wachsen gebracht") and 1,89,8: says that the *devas* have decided upon the age of human life.

b) Throughout the entire RV. we come across prayers to the *devas* to prolong the lives of mankind: 1,10,11:. Compare also: 1,34,11: *prāyus tāriṣṭam ni rapāṃsi mṛkṣataṃ sedhataṃ dveṣo bhavataṃ sacābhuvā*: Geldner renders: "(O Aśvins) prolong this life, ward off all evil, do away with enmity, be to us a friend and helper"[27]). We encounter prayers as: "do not rob us of our lives", cf. 1,24,11:.

c) The *devas* have the power to shorten life's span (1,92,10:).

d) The *devas* give life as a grant, to our children. So they are besought for offspring, 1,113,17: cf. also 6,67,4: *garbham aditir bharadhyai* "may Aditi give pregnancy".

4) Especially the Adityas have a close relation to the *vrata devānām*, also Indra and Savitr. In 6,68,9: the mighty ruler is revealed as Varuṇa: *mahinā mahivratah*, which Geldner renders: "Er der mit Macht mächtig Gebietende" ... and also: *ya urvī ... vibhāti:* "who as *mahivratah* shines his light through the Universe".

19. The *devas* are the rulers of the Universe.

This quality is of the greatest importance. Certainly it has been revealed implicitly in 18 about the *vrata devānām*, but quite explicitly we hear that they are:

a) Creators or begetters of Agni in whom heaven and earth rest and who rule both worlds cf. 1,59,2:. Also 2,40,1: where Soma and Pūṣan are mentioned as procreators of the world. Worth noting is: Agni governs this world and the *devas* beget this *deva* Agni; cf. 1,59,2:.

b) The Adityas and Savitṛ are the rulers of the Universe. Then they are the leaders of mankind (1,90,1:) *Varuṇo Mitro ... devaiḥ sajoṣāḥ* "unanimously together with the *devas*". They show us the right path (1,169,5:). They protect this world: *viśvasya bhuvanasya gopāḥ;* cf. 2,27,4: and also 2,38,2: 4:. Some *devas* are the kings of all nations *samrājam* cf. 3,10,1 (Agni) and 5,68,2: 6,68,9: 8,25,4:. Indra is called a chieftain of the clan *viśpati* cf. 3,40,3: and Soma: *sahasrajit* 9,80,4:. There are expressions like *rājā kṛṣṭinām (4,17,5:)* Indra, or *rājā devaḥ* (Soma 9,108,8:) as well as *viśvasya gopā* "Guardians of the Universe" to Mitra-Varuṇa (8,25,1:).

And again in 9,86,30: Soma is praised as: "all worlds are under thou" and hymn 4,53 lauds *deva* Savitṛ as *asura*, as the great governor of heaven and earth. From him emanates authority and he keeps an eye on every law and any being; he commands the *Universe* and grants offspring.

c) The *devas* also stand for restoration of the disturbed *order* either physical or moral. It is therefore that one prays to them for forgiveness, e.g. 1,25,1 ff. is a hymn to invoke pardon of god; cf also 2,29: and 5,85,8:. And almost always it is Varuṇa who pardons the human beings.

Their will *for redress expresses itself by their institution of punishments* cf. 1,190,5: (Bṛhaspati) and 2,29,5: where Mitra-Varuṇa, Aditi, Indra and the Maruts are the avengers of the law.

the great hero through whom the *devas* overcame the *dasyus*"[30]).
Indra beats the *dasyus:* 2,12,10:.

So we come across an adjective *dasyuhan* 1,100,12: 6,16,15: 45,24: 8,76,11: 77,3: 39,8:. And in their battles they are quick and swift like the chariots of the Maruts cf. 1,186,8:.

24. The *devas* always ride something.

This seems to indicate sublimity and augustness. They are driven to the place of sacrifice cf. 1,84,18: 6,55,6:. Agni is the one who has to invite them and drive them cf. 1,74,6: 142,1:[31]) *devā ā vahān āśu homa.*

Not only to sacrifice and to the rites, but the *devas* ride always: *vahnibhir devair . . . sayāvabhiḥ* (1,44,13:). Sometimes the priest is told to carry the *devas* to the place of offerings, cf. 2,36,4:.

And last Agni is named the "Charioteer of the *devas*", thus Geldner renders the term *aratir* (o.c., I, p. 281) cf. 2,4,2: 1,128,6: 4,2,1: 6,12,3: 15,4: 67,8: 10,3, passim: 45,7:. Sometimes we read that the Aśvins take the *devas* for a ride in their chariot, 7,72,2:.

In my opinion this riding is nothing else than a metaphor. They do not touch the earth; they are too exalted to go on foot. Perhaps this may not point to a divine trait, but certainly it shows the high respect the Vedic Indian had for his *devas*. Even nowadays only the husband goes on horseback while his wife follows on foot, so does the bhanya ride and his servants walk, sometimes, they lead a horse behind them. As soon as their employer disappears, they mount and proceed on horseback.

25. Several times the might and power of the *devas* are lauded in this way, that their friendship is praised so highly and called of greatest importance.

Geldner renders in his 1st ed. *duvaḥ* with "friendship" cf. 1,36,14: 3,16,4: 5,50,1: 22,3:. Those passages show clearly the great value we have to attach to the friendship and favour of the *devas*. Every mortal should try and acquire the friendship of the *devas* cf. 1,136,7: *ūtī devānāṃ vayam indravanto maṃsīmahi svayaśaso marudbhiḥ*. Geldner renders: "By the help (or favour) of the *devas*, possessing the favour of Indra, by the Maruts we may feel ourselves honoured". And 4,10,8: quite evidently says: friendship and brotherhood with the *devas* is quite profitable to us. 1,36,12: informs us that Agni is powerful and wealthy as he possesses the friendship of the *devas*.

26. The *devas* have some relationship to light.

So many authors share the opinion that *deva* is to be derived

22. The *devas* are strong and powerful.

That sort of description we encounter with the *devas* in a large variety: *vājin* "strong, powerful but especially powerful-in-battle". Geldner accordingly translates "Siegesstark", cf. 1,23,19.

This term frequently occurs with the *devas* as genus, and with the individuals as well. So often with Agni: 2,1,12:. But also other terms are in use: *sahasāvan* 1,91,23: "mighty and enormous", said of Soma: to Agni 1,189,5: 3,1,22: 5,20,4: 6,15,12: 7,1,24: 10,21,4: 115,8: cf. also 7,4,6: 43,5:, to Indra 7,19,7: 10,93,11:.

There is a slight nuance in *sahasāna:* to Agni 2,10,6: 5,25,9: 7,7,1: and also 1,189,8:.

We meet *kratur amṛktaḥ* "of unbroken power" cf. 3,11,6: 9,69,5: so *apratīta* "irresistible" 6,73,3:.

Another term of great importance for the history of Indian Religions is *māyā*. In his paper on "*māyā*" Prof. Gonda gives a survey of the concept. In short, he states, it is a special knowledge and wisdom and power directed by that knowledge:

1) cosmic power cf. RV. 3,61,7: 1,160,3: and with the content of incomprehensible creative force. cf. 10,24,4: 53,9: 9,83,3:. An incomprehensible command often ascribed to mighty beings;

2) power to assume another shape or form cf. 3,53,8: 6,47,18:;

3) sometimes one could translate it as "fraud";

4) elsewhere one encounters traits of trick and strategem and subtle device;

5) or the magic power to make oneself invisible;

6) and the tricks of an illusionist, etc. [20]).

Working through the texts I found myself a meaning like: "might and power by ruse and cunning" cf. 3,20,3: 27,7: 61,7: 5,63,4: 10,54,2:.

Another trait we find in *sahasā jāyamānaḥ* (6,44,22:) "born through power" or expressions like *sūnu sahasaḥ:* "Son of force" (7,1,22) [21]) or *putra sahasaḥ* cf. 2,7,6: 5,11,6:. I discovered a single passage where one could consider that irresistibility is a consequence of magic power: 6,73,3: *apratīto bṛhaspatir hanty amitram arkaih* "Bṛhaspati the irresistible beats his enemy by his (sacred) hymns".

23. *The devas beat the dasyu.*

The *devas* use their force to conquer and overcome the *dasyu*, who were probably the aboriginals of India at the time the Aryans invaded it: cf. 3,29,9: *Agniḥ . . . suvīro yena devāso asahanta dasyūn:* "Agni

Thus we have to recognise the high and supreme dignity of the *devas* in the eyes of the Vedic Indians. So far above us are the *devas* that even their abode is invisible.

27. A series of descriptive attributes.

a) *mayobhu* or *mayobhū*.

Grassmann and Geldner both render this as: "givers of joy and gladness, refreshing". This [illegible]

[illegible]

Something of like meaning is *raṇva*, sometimes however: "finding one's joy in warfare" cf. 4,37,1: for Agni 1,69,4: 5: Bṛhaspati 2,24,11: the Rbhus 4,37,1:.

b) *maghavan*: "rich in gifts" with a nuance of: "prepared to bestow those gifts upon someone". This is an almost exclusive name and epithet of Indra. cf. 1,33,12: 15: 52,11 [32]). The same is said too of Brahmaṇaspati cf. 2,24,12: Soma (4,28,5:) and Agni (5,86,3:) but as connected with Indra. We may conclude that *maghavan* is the epithet of Indra. This might disclose his own character: "powerful, rich, enormous also in bestowing grants upon others".

We also find another term related to it: *māghona* "liberally, and generously powerful" cf. 4,17,5: 6,43,4: 10,66,2: 107,1:. Of course the liberality occurs to us in a different expression, 4,35,8: "thou bestower of treasures" or 4,36,5: "whom the gods favour, he is a most eminent one".

c) So we come across the opinion that the *devas* fulfil the wishes and heart's desires of the mortals: cf. Agni *deveṣu vanate vāryāṇi* 5,4,3: and 6,15,6: *devo deveṣu vanate vāryam* and the same we find expressed in 5,41,7: *martyo ... devāso vanate*. In a sūkta addressed to Agni we find *draviṇasyavaḥ* which Geldner renders "die wir nach Reichtum verlangen"; cf. 5,13,2:.

d) Something similar is found about the god Savitṛ. 5,82,1: where Savitṛ is said to be *sarvadhātana*: "bestowing everything" so also *sarvadhā* occurs to Soma 9,18,1: and to Bhāga 8,31,11:.

e) *vasu* "good-natured" is said of Agni 5,25,1: [33]) and 5,41,18: 7,38,3: is said about all *devas*: *devās vasavaḥ*. Reminding the reader of 27b.) we will certainly not feel surprised to hear Indra praised as *vasu* as well cf. 1,10,4: [34]).

f) *sukṛta* is said of some *devas*: Indra cf. 3,30,13: 32,8: 34,6: 6,19,1:. It should mean here: "honest, upright, honorable". As the

from the root *div-* denoting the idea of celestial light following M. Williams, Grassmann, and L. von Schröder, and several texts show us that some *devas* at least are spirits of light cf. 1,19,5: where they are called *śubrāḥ* "shining, radiant, bright, white". St. 6 says that the *devas* live *rocane divi* "in the light-giving sky". Especially in maṇḍala 3—6 those passages about light stand out. However, those phrases do not occur in connexion with the *devas* as a group, but are connected with the names of definite *devas*, so e.g. 1,35,8: 3,62,10: 4,14,1: 2: 13,1: 2: 4: 5,81,4: 5: and 5,82,4: 5: to Savitṛ. The same to Agni 5,6,4: 6,48,7: Pūṣan 6,58,1: and Uṣas 6,64,5: she is called too: *divo duhitar* "daughter of the shining firmament" (6,64,5:). She and Agni are called *divijā:* "born or begotten in the sky" (7,75,1: 6,65,1: 8,43,28:) and 10,88,7: speaks about *divi yoni:* "in the womb of the sky".

b) They are called *divispṛśaḥ* "touching heaven" cf. 1,22,2: 23,2: 5,13,2: 9,11,4: 10,88,1: and Savitṛ is said to fill out the heavenly and earthly spaces cf. 4,53,3:.

c) The same sky is also the dwelling place of the *devas* cf. 3,6,8: and 1,19,6: too tell us that the *devās divo rocane santi:* "they dwell in the light-giving sky". On this *rocane* Lüders gives a few remarks in his Varuṇa I, p. 66.

Rocane divi is the invisible heaven, whereas *nāka* is firmament, visible to us; cf. *rocane divaḥ* in 8,10,1: 97,5: 9,86,27:. So *rocanaṃ divaḥ* 8,98,3: and *divaś cid rocanād* occurs cf. 1,49,1: 5,56,1: 8,8,7:.

1,6,9: no doubt points out that the *devas* are in heaven and also that they dwell there with certain preference in *rocane divaḥ*. From there they depart in order to go to the place of sacrifices 8,10,1:. On the other hand it is not the only name for the abode of the *devas*. We also encounter the *antarikṣa*. That is the intermediate space between heaven and earth: 1,164,39: speaks of *yasmin devā niṣeduḥ parame vyomani*, and again 3,6,8: *antarikṣe madanti* "the devas dwell in the sky or atmosphere" and immediately follows: *divo vā ye rocane santi devāḥ*, thus putting *antarikṣa* and *rocane devas* on the same level.

6,50,11: however, suggests that the *devas* not only belong to heaven, but to earth as well: "born in the cow", "born in the waters" and 6,52,13: says *antarikṣa* is to be separated from *ya upa dyāvi ṣṭha*. Though *rocana* and *antarikṣa* are on the same footing, *antarikṣa* is shown in 6,52,13: not to be identical with *dyāvi ṣṭha*.

8,58,3: says that the *rocane divaḥ* "the invisible sky" is threefold *triṣv ā rocane divaḥ*. One has to see the *rocane divaḥ* as a shining, light giving heavenly abode, yet hidden to our earthly eyes. There are even fields, where the heavenly horses dwell cf. 1,162,7: *devānām puṣṭe*.

Thus we have to recognise the high and supreme dignity of the *devas* in the eyes of the Vedic Indians. So far above us are the *devas* that even their abode is invisible.

27. A series of descriptive attributes.

a) *mayobhu* or *mayobhū*.

Grassmann and Geldner both render this as: "givers of joy and gladness: refreshing". This occurs for Pūṣan 1,138,2: Agni 3,26,1: The Adityas 5,42,1: and brahma id. 2: the Aśvins 5,43,8: 73,9: 8,8,9: and also 1,92,18: the Maruts 1,166,3: 8,20,24:.

Something of like meaning is *raṇva*, sometimes however: "finding one's joy in warfare" cf. 4,37,1: for Agni 1,69,4: 5: Bṛhaspati 2,24,11: the Ṛbhus 4,37,1:.

b) *maghavan:* "rich in gifts" with a nuance of: "prepared to bestow those gifts upon someone". This is an almost exclusive name and epithet of Indra. cf. 1,33,12: 15: 52,11 [22]). The same is said too of Brahmaṇaspati cf. 2,24,12: Soma (4,28,5:) and Agni (5,86,3:) but as connected with Indra. We may conclude that *maghavan* is the epithet of Indra. This might disclose his own character: "powerful, rich, enormous also in bestowing grants upon others".

We also find another term related to it: *māghona* "liberally, and generously powerful" cf. 4,17,5: 6,43,4: 10,66,2: 107,1:. Of course the liberality occurs to us in a different expression, 4,35,8: "thou bestower of treasures" or 4,36,5: "whom the gods favour, he is a most eminent one".

c) So we come across the opinion that the *devas* fulfil the wishes and heart's desires of the mortals: cf. Agni deveṣu *vanate vāryāṇi* 5,4,3: and 6,15,6: *devo deveṣu vanate vāryam* and the same we find expressed in 5,41,7: *martyo ... devāso vanate*. In a sūkta addressed to Agni we find *draviṇasyavaḥ* which Geldner renders "die wir nach Reichtum verlangen"; cf. 5,13,2:.

d) Something similar is found about the god Savitṛ. 5,82,1: where Savitṛ is said to be *sarvadhātana:* "bestowing everything" so also *sarvadhā* occurs to Soma 9,18,1: and to Bhāga 8,31,11:.

e) *vasu* "good-natured" is said of Agni 5,25,1: [23]) and 5,41,18: 7,38,3: is said about all *devas: devās vasavaḥ*. Reminding the reader of 27b.) we will certainly not feel surprised to hear Indra praised as *vasu* as well cf. 1,10,4: [24]).

f) *sukṛta* is said of some *devas:* Indra cf. 3,30,13: 32,8: 34,6: 6,19,1:. It should mean here: "honest, upright, honorable". As the

literal meaning is: "well done", this could be the reason that it has not been often used with the *devas*, cf. 5,66,1:.

g) They praise their *devas* as *satyas* "true, truthful". In times to come this very epithet will be of greatest importance; it will be the technical term for the essence of every being. Up to now it does not play a prominent part. We hear Agni called *satya*: most often connected with *hotṛ* cf. 1,1,5: and 1,76,5: 3,14,1:. Only 5,25,2: praises him as the *satya* "the true".

Uṣas only once receives this epithet 7,75,7: and the *devas* as genus just occasionally are worshipped with *satya* cf. 7,75,7:, so Indra is called *satya*, often connected with other adjectives cf. 1,63,3: 2,22,1: 4,16,1: 6,22,1: 8,40,11: 62,12:. This very Indra is lauded in 8,69,4: as "son of truth" and 4,17,5: worships him as "the True".

h) *pracetas*, and other terms expressing wisdom.

We encounter the concept of wisdom under several terms in different nuances. RV. appears to regard wisdom as one of the most characteristic traits of the *devas*, either as genus, or as individuals.

A group of texts reveres the *devas* as being wise, but also: full of insight. cf. 1,44,7: 2,23,2: 4,1,1: 10,63,8: 66,1: 85,17:. Elsewhere Varuṇa is mentioned as *asura* full of wisdom cf. 1,24,14: 41,1: 5,71,2:. In other passages Geldner renders it by "vorsorgend". Why? maybe as a special token of wisdom, cf. 8,67,17: 47,4: 83,5:. So Agni is called "sensible and foreseeing" cf. 2,10,3: [23]). So also Indra 1,5,7: 7,31,10: 8,90,6:. It is at least debatable if this wisdom of Indra's is just what it is purported to be — cf. 1,5,7: where Indra is praised as the "wise one" and at the same time described as "full of soma".

I feel forced to note that those passages do not make it clear what the Indian in Vedic times considered wisdom. One of these nuances is *vicetas* meaning "wise and gifted with right insight". The *devas* as a group are honoured only once by this epithet cf. 1,45,2:. Agni, Indra, the Maruts, and Mitra Varuṇa also several times, but human beings too: cf. 7,7,4:.

There are other expressions like: *dhiyā* "with intellect" (1,46,2:) "detecting treasures" (1,91,23:) "sind die Hüter der ganzen Welt" (2,27,4:) *dirghādhiyaḥ* "with great ideas" and *kavikratu* cf. 3,14,7: almost exclusively used for Agni. Cf. also 1,1,5: 27,12: 5,11,4: 6,16,23:. We come across *dakṣa* (3,14,7:) and *sudakṣa* (7,66,2:) Stchoupak, Nitti and Renou explain this term as "capable, adroit, habile, expert, compétent, intelligent, actif, convenable, commode" o.c., p. 296.

Other terms such as *kavi*, *kavitara* and *kavitama* occur frequently cf. 3,54,17: [24]). In their dictionary the same French authors render

this term as: "intelligent, prudent, sage; penseur, sage, prophète, poète, chantre" (o.c., p. 184). *Kratu* — we already referred to *sukratu* — is of the same content. Used for Indra cf. 1,5,6: 51,13: for Varuṇa cf. 1, 25,10: 12: 123,8: 5,65,1: 7,61,2: 8,25,2: 5: 8: for Agni 1,77,3: 3,3,7: 8,19,17:. Maṇḍala 9th is the Soma-collection of hymns. Everywhere one comes across the terms *kratu* and *sukratu* relating to Soma. cf. 9,2,3: 12,4: 48,3: 63,28: 65,30: 70,6: 72,8: 73,8: 86,43: 102,3:. *Vidvān:* part. perf. "qui sait, savant, sage, intelligent, versé dans" o.c. p. 657. It seems that the Vedic Indian saw this trait as characteristic of the *deva* concept, cf. 1,24,13: 103,3: 145,5: 190,7: cf. also 116,11: 120,3:*"). Another shade of meaning: *viśvavedas:* "knowing everything". This epithet is met with *viśvadeva* cf. 8,27,2: 4: 11: 10,66: 5:. So also with Indra cf. 6,47,12: and 10,131,6:. We hear Agni praised as *viśvavedas* in 1,21,1: 36,3: 44,7: 128,8: 147,3: 3,20,4: 25,1: 4,4,13: and also the Ādityas 8,18,11: 25,3: 5,67,3:.

i) Another epithet shows the *devas* as "being unanimous", united in their intentions and the like: *sajoṣa* cf. 2,31,2: 5,21,3:. Also "unanimously deciding" cf. 6,67,5: 7,34,15: yet 7,72,2: 8,26,8: where it may express "together". The related texts show in all shades and are used for the *devas* generally speaking, as well as individually of Agni, the Maruts, and Varuṇa.

j) *amīvacātana* "warding off diseases". A good number of passages laud the *devas* as having a personal power to cure. Thus "upon your word the illness will disappear" cf. 1,12,7: 35,9: 6,74,2: 10,37,4: 63,12: 100,8: 162,1: 2:.

Another term occurs: *bhiṣajy* "to cure" in the sense of "being physician" and this is usually said of the Aśvins. They are the practitioners of Indian medicine and the patron saints of it as well cf. 8,9,6: 22,10: 10,131,5:.

k) *śruṣṭīvan* "listening".

Its proper meaning is: "Listening to someone and always ready to listen" with a shade of: "ready to grant the wishes the *deva* hears of". So the *devas* are addressed in 1,45,2: Also the Aśvins 1,119,1: and Agni 1,127,9. cf. also 3,27,2: with the expectation of being answered in gifts asked for. Agni is lauded as: "the one who grants our wishes" or as Geldner renders it: "Den Erhörenden, der das Erwartete besitzt".

l) In my opinion a rather odd epithet is: *uṣarbudh:* "early riser". One can only understand this epithet, if it has the meaning of "early risen" in order to bestow our wishes and so, as to guard our ways and to ward off evil. It is used of all *devas* as group cf. 1,14,9:

44,1: 9:·92,18: where Geldner inserts: "the priests" and refers to 7,76,6:. Sometimes there can be felt a nuance of: "early to be present at the offerings". This very epithet is used with a certain preference for Agni, but here as priest performing the rites cf. 1,127,10: 132,2: 65,9: 3,2,14: 6,4,2: 15,1:.

We encounter a nuance of "vigilant" in 8,89,1: And this adjective we often find with Agni: "he is the watchman of the *devas*" cf. 1,31,9: 3,26,3:. Elsewhere he is praised as "wakeful" 3,2,12: and 24,3:. In 3,3,7: he is named in short: "the vigilant one". His alertness is extended to include human beings cf. 5,11,1: Indra received the same epithet only once "thou watchful" 8,92,23: Soma receives it oftener, at times as a substantive 9,97,37: sometimes as an adjective cf. 9,36,2: 44,3: 71,1: 97,2: 106,4: 107,6:.

28. Some of the attributes of a less sublime character.

Under this heading I should like to collect a number of utterances to be taken as widely as possible, to prove that the *devas* had some less sublime traits of character, or certain weaknesses, either moral, or physical, and this is most important as we cannot believe that the Vedic Indians did not think that those qualities are incompatible with a Supreme Being.

a) *devānāṃ dviṣ* "the hatred of the *devas*".

So 1,133,7 implores Indra to ward off the hatred of the *devas*. What this enmity consists of is not mentioned, but the context suggests: piśācis and the witches with their harmful power. 1,39,10: speaks of the enmity of the Maruts, but this is a just punishment for everyone who acts against the *ṛṣis*. But Agni (2,7,2:) and Soma (8,79,9:) are requested to protect us against the hatred of the *devas* and men. No word is said about the cause of this ill-feeling.

b) 1,142,9: *śucir deveṣv arpitā hotrā marutsu bhāratī:* "die reine unter die Götter, unter die Maruts versetzte Hotrā Bhāratī". I cannot help supposing that this suggests that some *devas* have not any right to receive this epithet of *śuci*. Yet, the term *aśuci* does not occur in RV. *Śuci is only occasionally used of the devas as a group cf. 7,2,2: more* used with a number of individuals like Agni, Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati and the Maruts.

c) We now come to a series of epithets that prove and demonstrate the limitation of power, knowledge and the like.

1° We read in RV. 1,164,50: about *the pūrve devāḥ:* the Sādhyas, "the former *devas*". One has to feel and accept here a clear and obvious dethronement and degradation.

Geldner refers to 7,21,7: where he renders *pūrve devās* as "die äl[illegible]en Götter". Indra has been their chieftain. cf. 10, 90,16:. Heaven has been mentioned here as the dwelling-place of those "retired" *devas*. 10,191,2: knows that those *pūrve devas* are unanimous at the table of offering. This is an obvious and evident proof, that the Vedic Indian could not find any difficulty in admitting a degradation and loss of supremacy even with regard to the *devas*. So we may safely conclude that the *devas* lack absolute independence, and so the envy which we shall mention later on, exists even among the *devas*.

2° RV. 1,100,15: relates that Indra exceeds all *devas* in might and power. The *devas* may have great power, but their influence is nevertheless limited: *na yasya devā devatā na martā āpaścana śavaso antam āpuḥ* "Whose force the *devas* with their *deva* power neither the mortals nor even the waters have found a limit for". Here we could even trace a hint that men are not so far behind the *devas* in power and influence. This limitation of power we may learn too in 3,2,3: the *devas* want to extend their power and influence. In order to reach this aim, they procreate Agni.

We could find another way of detecting the limitation o[illegible] in 1,160,4: where we hear about *devānām apasām apastamaḥ*: "[illegible] the most able craftsman among the able *devas*". More often we come across the term *vāvṛdhānaḥ* "strengthening the *devas*"; one causes an increase in force and influence e.g. 5.3.10:. Agni is [illegible] so in 5,16,1: where *bṛhad vayo* [illegible] tells us that "by sacred hymns [illegible] and Agni grow every day in [illegible] *vṛdhantau*, and again 6,22,11: where one [illegible] nei[illegible] lin[illegible] plores them to do their utmost *tā naḥ śaktam*: "do what you are able to do". Do not think that this is the full number of passages relating this limitedness of *the devas'* power. Everywhere in RV. we come across those places where man praises the still increasing force of the *devas*. One remark more is to be made. Logically one can reason [illegible] talking about the increase of might, implicitly acknowledges and proves "lack of almightiness". But the other way round, one could consider these frequent references to increasing influence the str[illegible] way of saying that the *devas* are almighty. It would be worth [illegible] to consider this remark.

This [illegible] Ma[illegible] the [illegible] means of sacrifices and by mutual

44,1: 9: 92,18: where Geldner inserts: "the priests" and refers to 7,76,6:. Sometimes there can be felt a nuance of: "early to be present at the offerings". This very epithet is used with a certain preference for Agni, but here as priest performing the rites cf. 1,127,10: 132,2: 65,9: 3,2,14: 6,4,2: 15,1:.

We encounter a nuance of "vigilant" in 8,89,1: And this adjective we often find with Agni: "he is the watchman of the *devas*" cf. 1,31,9: 3,26,3:. Elsewhere he is praised as "wakeful" 3,2,12: and 24,3:. In 3,3,7: he is named in short: "the vigilant one". His alertness is extended to include human beings cf. 5,11,1: Indra received the same epithet only once "thou watchful" 8,92,23: Soma receives it oftener, at times as a substantive 9,97,37: sometimes as an adjective cf. 9,36,2: 44,3: 71,1: 97,2: 106,4: 107,6:.

28. Some of the attributes of a less sublime character.

Under this heading I should like to collect a number of utterances to be taken as widely as possible, to prove that the *devas* had some less sublime traits of character, or certain weaknesses, either moral, or physical, and this is most important as we cannot believe that the Vedic Indians did not think that those qualities are incompatible with a Supreme Being.

a) *devānāṃ dviṣ* "the hatred of the *devas*".

So 1,133,7 *implores* Indra *to ward off* the hatred of the *devas*. What this enmity consists of is not mentioned, but the context suggests: piśācis and the witches with their harmful power. 1,39,10: speaks of the enmity of the Maruts, but this is a just punishment for everyone who acts against the *ṛṣis*. But Agni (2,7,2:) and Soma (8,79,9:) are requested to protect us against the hatred of the *devas* and men. No word is said about the cause of this ill-feeling.

b) 1,142,9: *śucir deveṣv arpitā hotrā marutsu bhāratī*. "die reine unter die Götter, unter die Maruts versetzte Hotrā Bhāratī". I cannot help supposing that this suggests that some *devas* have not any right to receive this epithet of *śuci*. Yet, the term *aśuci* does not occur in RV. *Śuci* is only occasionally used of the *devas* as a group cf. 7,2,2: more used with a number of individuals like Agni, Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati and the Maruts.

c) We now come to a series of epithets that prove and demonstrate the limitation of power, knowledge and the like.

1° We read in RV. 1,164,50: about the *pūrve devāḥ*: the Sādhyas, "the former *devas*". One has to feel and accept here a clear and obvious dethronement and degradation.

tan cf. 1,69,2: *devau divaḥ* "Son of heaven" cf. 5,74,1:. This father is Agni, but elsewhere it may be Brahmanaspati, who receives the epithet of *devānām pitā* cf. 2,26,3: 3,54,9:. Rodasī (Heaven-and-Earth) are *devaputre*. Soma begot the *devas* (9,42,4:) and *devī janitrī* procreated Indra cf. 10,134,1—6.

We may distinguish a certain kinship and moreover family relations among the *devas*. 2,32,6: speaks of *svasā devānām* "a sister of the gods" (one out of many) and 8.101,15: speaks about the sisters of the Adityas cf. also 1,124,8:. Uṣas 1,180,2: 123,5: and 191,6: speaks of Aditi. Elsewhere we encounter the relation of brother of Agni 1,161,1: 3: 164,1: 4,1,2: 6,51,5: 8,43,16: 10,7,3: 11,2: also of Soma 1,191,6: and of Indra cf. 1,170,2: 3,53,5: 6,55,5:. Sometimes one encounters expressions that the *devas* are *our* brothers cf. 10,11,2:. Geldner remarks in his note o.c. III, p. 137 "der Älteste (Amts)bruder des Priesters insbesondere des Hotr ist Agni. Gemeint is doch wohl: er soll entscheiden was wir als Belohnung bekommen sollen" cf. also 10,7,3: and 186,2:.

So we meet a material principle as begetter of the devas cf. 6,50,11: and 10,65,9: they are called *divyāḥ, pārthivāsaḥ, gojātāḥ* (10,53,5:) and *āpyāḥ*: showing from whence they proceeded and where they belong. About *āptya* I want to add some notes. Some scholars tried to explain the figure and position of Trita āptya. E. Hardy [38]) saw Trita āptya as a lunar deity, Macdonell [39]) as a thunder and lightning divinity. Bloomfield in PAOS. March 1894 considered Trita with his brothers Ekata and Dvita as the scapegoat of the Gods. Hillebrandt considered Trita as a deity closely connected with the cloudless sky, and Max Müller [40]) wished to prove Trita āptya to be a solar [illegible] K. Rönnow made a special research on [illegible] clusion was that Trita āpt[illegible] his opinion on RV. 10,46 [illegible] Varuṇa, having special relations with the waters, (as regards oaths and contracts) is called Trita. Further on he holds (o.c. p. 25) that Trita is a lustration god; together with his next of kin Ekata and Dvita; he purifies the *devas* and sacrifice (o.c. p. 28). It woud be outside the scope of this work to prolong this discussion, but it is worth while reading this paper by Rönnow. To end this paragraph I would like to cite a few more passages relating to the kinship of the *devas*. We come across terms as *janiman* cf. 2,35,6: 3,1,4: 20: 4,10: [41]). Also *janma* which could mean "race, birth" or even "place of birth". cf. 1,20,1: 70,6: 71,3: [42]). So *viś* "clan, group of families" cf. 1,39,5: 50,5: 4,2,3: 5,26,9: 8,58,3: 64,8: 69,3: 75,8: and 2,26,3:.

The Vedic Indian thought their *devas* had come into being by birth, in a place, living in clans or family groups, maybe in nations.

assistance cf. 10,14,3: and we find other means more detailed listed here: by ghṛta (3,5,8:) by the soma-draught (3,52,8:) by stoma-hymns (5,22,4:) by *karma* (9,46,3:) by *arka* "rays of light" (8,16,9:) by thoughts *mati* (7,12,3:) and *yajña* "offering" (2,2,1:). It is worth while remarking that the same is never said of Mitra-Varuṇa.

3° The *devas* are not omniscient.

4,58,4: The devas do not know where to find the ghṛta. And they crave for it. They find it anyway, hidden in the cow. But their lack of knowledge is demonstrated because they had to search for it.

4° The *devas* themselves are not totally independent.

They too have to obey the laws and institutions of the *ṛta* cf. 1,65,3: *ṛtasya devā anu vratā gur bhuvat*, and 2,38,9: Indra, even Mitra Varuṇa follow the orders of Savitṛ and elsewhere the *devas* are related as *devā devānām anu vratā guḥ* (3,7,7:). The *devas* are called *ṛtajñā*: "versed in ṛta" cf. 10,65,14: and also 7,38,8: 1,72,8: where implicitly is said "*that knowing the ṛta they keep it*". Again 4,55,2: and 5,51,2: they are praised as *ṛtadhitā* "who acknowledge the *ṛta*".

2° [illegible] mber of passages could make us believe that the *devas* are [illegible] men, perhaps with extraordinary gifts and talents, but any- [illegible] quite *human through weaknesses and imperfections.*

1° The devas are born *jajñānaḥ somaṃ sahase papātha*: "just born, thou drinkest already soma" 7,98,3: *cf.* also 4,22,3:. About their birth we can refer to 4,18,1: Geldner renders "der erprobte alte Weg, auf dem alle Götter geboren wurden", while 10,55,7: says that Indra begot the *devas;* they follow after Aditi in delivery cf. 10,72,8:. Agni [illegible]ten by the order devas cf. 1,59,2: 2,13,5: 6,15,18: 16,48: or [illegible],6: where the waters are referred to as creating Agni. 1,127,9: says that Agni is begotten for religion. Cf. Geldner o.c., I, p. 177 "Du Agni . . . als der ungestümste für den Götterdienst geboren". But could not *devatāti* mean: "the gathering (collectivity — the society) of the Gods"? Cf. Lat. *societas*, which *represents the same formation*. Yet, [illegible]me across passages where *deva* Agni has been begotten by the [illegible]an beings cf. 3,9,6: 5,3,8:. Agni himself produces in his turn the Angiras cf. 1,71,8:.

Indra is in the same circumstances. He has been begotten by a *deva* [illegible]*rzeuger*" *as Geldner renders it*. 2,13,5: *again relates to us the* [illegible]*vas* as procreators of Indra; 4,17,12: presents Indra, "who does not care for his parents", while 8,97,10: could be rendered as "begotten unto kingship". But eventually also "*made king*". *Indra is begotten* by Soma 7,21,1:. *Of course, we meet the consequences of this birth of the devas*, as we come across expressions like *devānām pitā* or *putraḥ*

Agni as their messenger and ambassador (6,15,8) cf. also 5,25,2: where our ancestors and *devas* together are the principle and origin of Agni.

6,48,20: *devas* and *martyas* are on equal footing, and 6,30,4: teaches that Indra is the greatest among *devas* and men. Moreover their utterances are equal cf. 3,60,1: and last of all 1,139,9: tells that our line of descent reaches heaven, and from the *devas* proceeds our race: Geldner translates: "Ihre Reihe reicht zu den Göttern, von diesen stammt unser Geschlecht". Possibly this last passage is saying just a little too much; however, the other passages quoted do — no doubt — *point out to us, that devas* and *martas* together appoint one and the same priest. *Devas* and *martas* have equal rights to be present at rites and sacrifices. They have one king Bṛhaspati, Varuṇa or Indra. They equally need protection and intercession, as well as assistance and support in their offerings. Their laws and rules have an absolute power.

1,84,19: may surprise us, but not so very much after what we have said and summed up before: *tvam aṅga pra śaṃsiṣo devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam:* Geldner renders: "Du allein Gott wirst den Sterblichen loben." Here the roles are reversed, because the *devas* so much long for sacrifices. Sacrifice belongs to them as a daily need and only mankind can provide them with it.

30. The *devas* are the centre of religious life.

Though we had to demonstrate the human sides of the *devas* as well, still we are bound to state that the *devas* are the centre of pious thoughts. 1,132,5: *didhiṣanta dhītayo devān achā na dhītayaḥ* "may pious thoughts prepare themselves an abode in Indra's heart, as it becomes the *devas* that devout thoughts go to them"; cf. also 1,139,1:.

So 1,141,11: is a prayer that a good family father (who is the priest of the family) be granted to lead the prayers and thoughts to the *devas*. cf. also 10,31,1: So *ūrdhvā dhītiḥ* are thoughts directed towards the *devas* or the Supreme Being. We are not so sure about 1,119,2:.

In order to go to the *devas* we have to be without sin: *devānāṃ dūtaḥ ... anāgān no vocatu* (3,54,19:) cf. also 7,86,7: 87,7. 91,2: 10,12,8: 36,12: where we are taught to serve the *devas* in purity of heart, without sin. So 1,189,1 Agni is the priest who forgives our sins in order that we may not be let astray. Moreover 2,27,4: shows us the *devas* demanding penance.

Concluding this summary of the RV. I should like to mention a few terms we encountered with the adjective *deva:* Grassmann and Stchou-

2° Some more strongly human adjectives.

Durmada "quarrelsome when drunk" cf. 1,32,6 39,5: *mandasva* "fuddle yourself with the devas"; cf. 2,36,3 [41]). *Mandin* "loving to get drunk" or as Geldner renders: "rauschliebend" cf. 1,9,2: 1,101,1: said of Indra. In 1,134,2: it is said about Vāyu. Sometimes one notices that the authors do not want to see the after-affects of soma as something mean and low, and in getting drunk the *devas* (one could suggest) commit a meritorious deed. May be this is just a matter of hide-and-seek on the side of the Brahmins, to avoid too strong a condemnation by the people, where the priests using this sacred draught with the *devas*, get fuddled too. Generally speaking the Indian nowadays abhors and detests any use of strong liquor.

The *devas* act prudently and carefully *kratunā* cf. 1,69,2: 141,9: 2,12,1: *manāvasū* "rich in thought" cf. 5,74,1: *vajrin:* "carrying the thunderbolt" the magic thunder hammer of Indra. It is a club of special make. Cf. 6,59,3: This epithet expresses tremendous power [42]).

Bhūrṇi "restless, agitated, exitedly active" cf. 3,3,5: 7,86,7:. *Purubhūtama* "many-sided" cf. 4,44,4: 5,73,2: 8,22,3: 12: 9,94,3: *supāṇi* "with good and able hands" 1,109,4: 71,9: 3,33,6: 54,12: 56,7: 6,49,9: 7,45,4:. Something similar is *sugabhasti* "with good arms" cf.6,49,9: *and ṛbhuvan "handy, being a good craftsman". cf. 1,20,4: 51,2: 110,7:* 8: 111,5: 3: 121,2: 161,6: 2,1,10: 3,5,6: 54,12: 6,49,9. and I believe there is no doubt that the last epithets show in concrete terms what the Indians thought of the omnipotence of their *devas* and of their power.

3° Men and *devas* on the same level.

1,19,2: *nahi devo na martyo mahas tava kratum paraḥ:* "your in*sight is not rivalled by deva or by any mortal", and in 1,161,2: we* hear that the sons of Sudhanvan are equal to sacrifices as the *devas*. 1,185,8: speaks of injustice towards *devas* and men. So in 1,190,1: *devas* and men listen equally to Bṛhaspati. *2,7,2:* "May not the enmity of devas and mortals fall upon us" and *2,27,10:* teaches that Varuṇa is king over *devas* and mortals. 3,3,6: *devas* and men offer their sacrifices equally and Agni is their priest. This certainly *indicates* some brotherhood and 4,10,8: speaks of this: *bhrātṛtva* between *devas* and men. Agni is to be their protector against violence and robbery cf. 4,12,5:.

This idea of similarity goes even further. Sin is something adverse to *devas* and mortals as well. Savitṛ should forgive us for both parties offended, and so is Agni the best priest among mankind: *yajiṣṭham mānuṣe jane* (5,14,2:). *Devas* and humans together appoint

Agni as their messenger and ambassador (6,15,8) cf. also 5,25,2: where our ancestors and *devas* together are the principle and origin of Agni.

6,48,20: *devas* and *martyas* are on equal footing, and 6,30,4: teaches that Indra is the greatest among *devas* and men. Moreover their utterances are equal cf. 3,60,1: and last of all 1,139,9: tells that our line of descent reaches heaven, and from the *devas* proceeds our race: Geldner translates: "Ihre Reihe reicht zu den Göttern, von diesen stammt unser Geschlecht". Possibly this last passage is saying just a little too much; however, the other passages quoted do — no doubt — point out to us, that *devas* and *martas* together appoint one and the same priest. *Devas* and *martas* have equal rights to be present at rites and sacrifices. They have one king Bṛhaspati, Varuṇa or Indra. They equally need protection and intercession, as well as assistance and support in their offerings. Their laws and rules have an absolute power.

1,84,19: may surprise us, but not so very much after what we have said and summed up before: *tvam aṅga pra śaṃsiṣo devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam:* Geldner renders: "Du allein Gott wirst den Sterblichen loben." Here the roles are reversed, because the *devas* so much long for sacrifices. Sacrifice belongs to them as a daily need and only mankind can provide them with it.

30. The *devas* are the centre of religious life.

Though we had to demonstrate the human sides of the *devas* as well, still we are bound to state that the *devas* are the centre of pious thoughts. 1,132,5: *didhiṣanta dhītayo devān acchā na dhītayaḥ* "may pious thoughts prepare themselves an abode in Indra's heart, as it becomes the *devas* that devout thoughts go to them"; cf. also 1,139,1:.

So 1,141,11: is a prayer that a good family father (who is the priest of the family) be granted to lead the prayers and thoughts to the *devas*. cf. also 10,31,1: So *ūrdhvā dhītiḥ* are thoughts directed towards the *devas* or the Supreme Being. We are not so sure about 1,119,2:.

In order to go to the *devas* we have to be without sin: *devānām dūtaḥ … anāgān no vocatu* (3,54,19:) cf. also 7,86,7: 87,7. 91,2: 10,12,8: 36,12: where we are taught to serve the *devas* in purity of heart, without sin. So 1,189,1 Agni is the priest who forgives our sins in order that we may not be let astray. Moreover 2,27,4: shows us the *devas* demanding penance.

Concluding this summary of the RV, I should like to mention a few terms we encountered with the adjective *deva:* Grassmann and Stchou-

2° Some more strongly human adjectives.

Durmada "quarrelsome when drunk" cf. 1,32,6 39,5: *mandasva* "fuddle yourself with the devas"; cf. 2,36,3 [41]). *Mandin* "loving to get drunk" or as Geldner renders: "rauschliebend" cf. 1,9,2: 1,101,1: said of Indra. In 1,134,2: it is said about Vāyu. Sometimes one notices that the authors do not want to see the after-affects of soma as something mean and low, and in getting drunk the *devas* (one could suggest) commit a meritorious deed. May be this is just a matter of hide-and-seek on the side of the Brahmins, to avoid too strong a condemnation by the people, where the priests using this sacred draught with the *devas*, get fuddled too. Generally speaking the Indian nowadays abhors and detests any use of strong liquor.

The *devas* act prudently and carefully *kratunā* cf. 1,69,2: 141,9: 2,12,1: *manāvasū* "rich in thought" cf. 5,74,1: *vajrin:* "carrying the thunderbolt" the magic thunder hammer of Indra. It is a club of special make. Cf. 6,59,3: This epithet expresses tremendous power [42]).

Bhūrṇi "restless, agitated, exitedly active" cf. 3,3,5: 7,86,7:. *Purubhūtama* "many-sided" cf. 4,44,4: 5,73,2: 8,22,3: 12: 9,94,3: *supāṇi* "with good and able hands" 1,109,4: 71,9: 3,33,6: 54,12: 56,7: 6,49,9: 7,45,4:. Something similar is *sugabhasti* "with good arms" cf.6,49,9: and *ṛbhuvan* "handy, being a good craftsman". cf. 1,20,4: 51,2: 110,7: 8: 111,5: 3: 121,2: 161,6: 2,1,10: 3,5,6: 54,12: 6,49,9: and I believe there is no doubt that the last epithets show in concrete terms what the Indians thought of the omnipotence of their *devas* and of their power.

3° Men and *devas* on the same level.

1,19,2: *nahi devo na martyo mahas tava kratum paraḥ:* "your insight is not rivalled by *deva* or by any mortal", and in 1,161,2: we hear that the sons of Sudhanvan are equal to sacrifices as the *devas*. 1,185,8: speaks of injustice towards *devas* and men. So in 1,190,1: *devas* and men listen equally to Bṛhaspati. 2,7,2: "May not the enmity of devas and mortals fall upon us" and 2,27,10: teaches that Varuṇa is king over *devas* and mortals. 3,3,6: *devas* and men offer their sacrifices equally and Agni is their priest. This certainly indicates some brotherhood and 4,10,8: speaks of this: *bhrātṛtva* between *devas* and men. Agni is to be their protector against violence and robbery cf. 4,12,5:.

This idea of similarity goes even further. Sin is something adverse to *devas* and mortals as well. Savitṛ should forgive us for both parties offended, and so is Agni the best priest among mankind: *yajiṣṭham mānuṣe jane* (5,14,2:). *Devas* and humans together appoint

portion of those human traits as anthropomorphisms. This may count for all those good traits like honesty and good-naturedness and helpfulness etc., but the weak and feeble sides of their character we must accept as a demonstration of their lack of pure and true divinity in the strict sense.

3. Finally there is a third group of elements of the *deva* concept, comprising what I should like to name "superhuman" or "supernormal". Here too we notice a group of sublime traits, e.g. the *devas* are exalted and powerful beings; protectors of mankind, and man needs them and is dependent upon them in many respects. They are strong and bellicose, and their friendship is of great importance. Some god-like qualities come forward as well, e.g. *amṛtya* "immortality" (in the sense of "utmost vitality"), their abode is the invisible heaven. Their wisdom is great, yet no omniscience. However, we come across some qualities that are intermingled with weakness and failings e.g. their power is combined with tricks and ruse. The *amṛtya* has been acquired and there is among them an order, with superiors and subjects. They are governed by laws and *vrata devānām*, and they have to obey.

Some qualities show that they are the object of sacrifices and hymns and that they are the centre of pious thinking. Man has to approach them in purity of heart. This last group of qualities exceeds by far those epithets that point out to divinity in the strict sense and those of purely human character. Moreover they exceed in number as well as in stress. As we meet those human qualities next to sublime ideas, ideas too lofty to be expressed properly in ordinary words, I am under the impression that this third group is decisive for our definition and description of the contents of the concept of *deva* according to the own ideas of the Indians. That does not mean that the average Indian has never made a sharpcut and principal discrimination between human, and superhuman and divine. Yet, here the task of the Science of Religions obviously lies: to discern the thoughts of the Indians themselves about the term *deva* rendered in terms comprehensible to us.

Concluding: I believe to be justified in inferring that *deva* has been considered a superhuman and powerful being who was able to help mankind by his own power.

This [illegible]
hu[illegible]
hig[illegible]

The *devas* are not men, except in a few respects: they are not God, though they participate in a few traits of his. They are an "in-between", they are superhuman, but subordinate to God. Whether

pak, Nitti, Renou render it by "heavenly" cf. 1,164,18; *manas*, 7,104,18; *adhvara*, 8,89,1: *jyotis*, 9,11,2: *payas*, 7,21,1: *andhas*.

Conclusions.

Here is a short concluding summary of the work on the RV.

1) The concept of *deva* has a small but important group of strictly supernatural elements, which certainly could convince us that deva stands for God in the strict sense. To sum up: a) adjectives composed with *ṛta* or substantive compounds, b) *asura* for inner value, c) the role of rulers of the universe, d) while at the same time their powers extend over life and death, e) and the quality by which they forgive the sins of man.

But we have to bring against this that those elements do not belong to the concept of deva in general, but adhere as title to the Adityas and above all to Varuṇa (or Varuṇa-Mitra). Some exceptional extension to Indra and Agni may be reckoned as ex ordine quasi-participantium. Personally I have the impression that the Vedic Indian himself has made this discrimination, clearly or vaguely, between *deva* in general and the Adityas; and that to the Adityas (especially to some of them) may be given the title of God, but not to the term *deva* qua talis.

2) Another group of components are the purely human qualities the *devas* seem to possess. Part of them belongs to and has connexion with the cultus, and therefore surely raises the human mind to higher spheres. I may point to terms as: *purohita*, *hotar*, *dūta* and the like. Some other epithets grant the *deva* a propitious, yet human character: just, benevolent, helpful, prudent, many-sided, liberal and rich in thoughts; and again other epithets provide the *devas* with the imperfections and weakness of mankind, as they are subject to laws. They are envious, full of hatred at times, ambitious, impatient and given to drink, not to mention their gluttony; they are powerful, yet limited in might. Sometimes we encounter the title *deva* when given to non-humans, even lifeless things while elsewhere we see *deva* and man on the same level.

This very large complex of human components in the concept of *deva* does not allow me to conclude that: *deva* is equal with God in the strict sense. What one might consider is that those sublime epithets given to the *devas*, are an exaggerated and superabundant praise, in order to win the *devas'* favour. But it does not prove that the Vedic Indian truly conceived the *devas* as gifted with strictly divine qualities. However, we feel inclined as well to consider an important

portion of those human traits as anthropomorphisms. This may count for all those good traits like honesty and good-naturedness and helpfulness etc., but the weak and feeble sides of their character we must accept as a demonstration of their lack of pure and true divinity in the strict sense.

3. Finally there is a third group of elements of the *deva* concept, comprising what I should like to name "superhuman" or "supernormal". Here too we notice a group of sublime traits, e.g. the *devas* are exalted and powerful beings; protectors of mankind, and man needs them and is dependent upon them in many respects. They are strong and bellicose, and their friendship is of great importance. Some god-like qualities come forward as well, e.g. *amṛtya* "immortality" (in the sense of "utmost vitality"), their abode is the invisible heaven. Their wisdom is great, yet no omniscience. However, we come across some qualities that are intermingled with weakness and failings e.g. their power is combined with tricks and ruse. The *amṛtya* has been acquired and there is among them an order, with superiors and subjects. They are governed by laws and *vrata devānām*, and they have to obey.

Some qualities show that they are the object of sacrifices and hymns and that they are the centre of pious thinking. Man has to approach them in purity of heart. This last group of qualities exceeds by far those epithets that point out to divinity in the strict sense and those of purely human character. Moreover they exceed in number as well as in stress. As we meet those human qualities next to sublime ideas, ideas too lofty to be expressed properly in ordinary words, I am under the impression that this third group is decisive for our definition and description of the contents of the concept of *deva* according to the own ideas of the Indians. That does not mean that the average Indian has never made a sharpcut and principal [illegible]
between [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] the term *deva* rendered in terms comprehensible to us.

Concluding: I believe to be justified in inferring that *deva* has been considered a superhuman and powerful being who was able to help mankind by his own power.

This [illegible]
huma [illegible]
high [illegible]

The *devas* are not men, except in a few respects: they are not God, though they participate in a few traits of his. They are an "in-between", they are superhuman, but subordinate to God. Whether

pak, Nitti, Renou render it by "heavenly" cf. 1,164,18; *manas*, 7,104,18; *adhvara*, 8,89,1: *jyotis*, 9,11,2: *payas*, 7,21,1: *andhas*.

Conclusions.

Here is a short concluding summary of the work on the RV.

1) The concept of *deva* has a small but important group of strictly supernatural elements, which certainly could convince us that deva stands for God in the strict sense. To sum up: a) adjectives composed with *ṛta* or substantive compounds, b) *asura* for inner value, c) the role of rulers of the universe, d) while at the same time their powers extend over life and death, e) and the quality by which they forgive the sins of man.

But we have to bring against this that those elements do not belong to the concept of deva in general, but adhere as title to the Adityas and above all to Varuṇa (or Varuṇa-Mitra). Some exceptional extension to Indra and Agni may be reckoned as ex ordine quasi-participantium. Personally I have the impression that the Vedic Indian himself has made this discrimination, clearly or vaguely, between *deva* in general and the Adityas; and that to the Adityas (especially to some of them) may be given the title of God, but not to the term *deva* qua talis.

2) Another group of components are the purely human qualities the *devas* seem to possess. Part of them belongs to and has connexion with the cultus, and therefore surely raises the human mind to higher spheres. I may point to terms as: *purohita*, *hotar*, *dūta* and the like. Some other epithets grant the *deva* a propitious, yet human character: just, benevolent, helpful, prudent, many-sided, liberal and rich in thoughts; and again other epithets provide the *devas* with the imperfections and weakness of mankind, as they are subject to laws. They are envious, full of hatred at times, ambitious, impatient and given to drink, not to mention their gluttony; they are powerful, yet limited in might. Sometimes we encounter the title *deva* when given to non-humans, even lifeless things while elsewhere we see *deva* and man on the same level.

This very large complex of human components in the concept of *deva* does not allow me to conclude that: *deva* is equal with God in the strict sense. What one might consider is that those sublime epithets given to the *devas*, are an exaggerated and superabundant praise, in order to win the *devas*' favour. But it does not prove that the Vedic Indian truly conceived the *devas* as gifted with strictly divine qualities. However, we feel inclined as well to consider an important

portion of those human traits as anthropomorphisms. This may count for all those good traits like honesty and good-naturedness and helpfulness etc., but the weak and feeble sides of their character we must accept as a demonstration of their lack of pure and true divinity in the strict sense.

3. Finally there is a third group of elements of the *deva* concept, comprising what I should like to name "superhuman" or "supernormal". Here too we notice a group of sublime traits, e.g. the *devas* are exalted and powerful beings; protectors of mankind, and man needs them and is dependent upon them in many respects. They are strong and bellicose, and their friendship is of great importance. Some god-like qualities come forward as well, e.g. *amṛtya* "immortality" (in the sense of "utmost vitality"), their abode is the invisible heaven. Their wisdom is great, yet no omniscience. However, we come across some qualities that are intermingled with weakness and failings e.g. their power is combined with tricks and ruse. The *amṛtya* has been acquired and there is among them an order, with superiors and subjects. They are governed by laws and *vrata devānām*, and they have to obey.

Some qualities show that they are the object of sacrifices and hymns and that they are the centre of pious thinking. Man has to approach *them in purity of heart*. This last group of qualities exceeds by far those epithets that point out to divinity in the strict sense and those of purely human character. Moreover *they exceed in* number as well as in stress. As we meet those human qualities next to sublime ideas, ideas too lofty to be expressed properly in ordinary words, I am under the impression that this third group is decisive for our definition and description of the contents *of the concept of deva* according to the own ideas of the Indians. That does not mean that the average Indian has never made a sharpcut and principal discrimination between human, and superhuman and divine. Yet, here the task of the Science of Religions *obviously* lies: to discern the thoughts of the Indians themselves about the term *deva* rendered in terms comprehensible to us.

Concluding: I believe to be justified in inferring that *deva* has been considered a superhuman and powerful being who was able to help mankind by his own power.

This personality of *deva* could be a screen that receives and collects human piety and religious needs, as the strictly Divine Being is too high and too far away from them.

The *devas* are not men, except in a few respects; they are not God, though they participate in a few traits of his. They are an "in-between", they are superhuman, but subordinate to God. Whether

pak, Nitti, Renou render it by "heavenly" cf. 1,164,18; *manas*, 7,104,18; *adhvara*, 8,89,1: *jyotis*, 9,11,2: *payas*, 7,21,1: *andhas*.

Conclusions.

Here is a short concluding summary of the work on the RV.

1) The concept of *deva* has a small but important group of strictly supernatural elements, which certainly could convince us that deva stands for God in the strict sense. To sum up: a) adjectives composed with *ṛta* or substantive compounds, b) *asura* for inner value, c) the role of rulers of the universe, d) while at the same time their powers extend over life and death, e) and the quality by which they forgive the sins of man.

But we have to bring against this that those elements do not belong to the concept of deva in general, but adhere as title to the Adityas and above all to Varuṇa (or Varuṇa-Mitra). Some exceptional extension to Indra and Agni may be reckoned as *ex ordine quasi-participantium*. Personally I have the impression that the Vedic Indian himself has made this discrimination, clearly or vaguely, between *deva* in general and the Adityas; and that to the Adityas (especially to some of them) may be given the title of God, but not to the term *deva* qua talis.

2) Another group of components are the purely human qualities the *devas* seem to possess. Part of them belongs to and has connexion with the cultus, and therefore surely raises the human mind to higher spheres. I may point to terms as: *purohita, hotar, dūta* and the like. Some other epithets grant the *deva* a propitious, yet human character: just, benevolent, helpful, prudent, many-sided, liberal and rich in thoughts; and again other epithets provide the *devas* with the imperfections and weakness of mankind, as they are subject to laws. They are envious, full of hatred at times, ambitious, impatient and given to drink, not to mention their gluttony; they are powerful, yet limited in might. Sometimes we encounter the title *deva* when given to non-humans, even lifeless things while elsewhere we see *deva* and man on the same level.

This very large complex of human components in the concept of *d.va* does not allow me to conclude that: *deva* is equal with God in the strict sense. What one might consider is that those sublime epithets given to the *devas*, are an exaggerated and superabundant praise, in order to win the *devas'* favour. But it does not prove that the Vedic Indian truly conceived the *devas* as gifted with strictly divine qualities. However, we feel inclined as well to consider an important

EXAMINATION OF THE ATHARVA VEDA

In my examination of the term *deva* in the AV., I have collected a number of passages where the term "*devas*" has been applied to several of the well-known *devas*. And it is interesting to notice which of them receives the title oftenest in this holy book of the Indians. It is not only interesting but even a bit disappointing as we would perhaps have expected that someone else was taking the record. Savitar is the one that is called *deva* more often than any one else, AV. 1,29,3: 6,1,1: 19,3: 23,3: 58,1: 99,3: 7,14,1: 3: 10,8,42: 5,14 [illegible]
27,2 [illegible]
abo[illegible]
19,2 [illegible]
[illegible]
as the makers of witchcraft. Only a few times this *deva*-title is [illegible] explanation about its contents — so infrequently mentioned in AV. The RV. is using it over and over again, in fact numberless times. Even less we find Iḍā, Sarasvatī and Aditi mentioned as *devīs*. Iḍā is called "ghee-footed, able, soma-backed and belonging to all the gods" (7,27).

Aditi is mentioned as devī (7,6,1: etc.) and receives a whole series of epithets otherwise given to several *devas*. Some of them are quite impressive, e.g.: *viśve devā aditiḥ* "Aditi is all the *devas* in one". *Pañca janā aditir jātam aditir janitvam:* "Aditi is the classes of beings, what is born and what is still to be born". In 7,6,2: she is praised as *ṛtasya patnīm* "spouse of *ṛta*" (the basis of everything), and *tuvikṣatrām, ajarantīm, urūcīm, supranītīm.*

7,68,1: Sarasvatī is called a *devī*.

Perhaps I may not join the words *devāḥ pūrve* with *deva* as a title. But for one reason one could still like to do so as *devāḥ pūrve* has no epithet whatsoever. Often translated as "gods of old" 5,17,6: 6,64,1: 7,5,1: 11,8,10: but generally speaking we were not able to find any explanation for this title which is not so often used. The only point that the last quotation shows us, is that the (new) *devas* inherited supremacy from these *devāḥ pūrve* from whom they

they are creatures or not, is not obvious in RV. Elsewhere it is quite evident that they are. Man felt himself directly dependent upon them and was afraid of the *devas*. It is therefore that the *deva* was the centre of religious thinking to the Vedic Indian.

as it is in use from olden times with every kind of tongue and people. [illegible] "exaggeration", [illegible] is not without [illegible] for well known [illegible] characters as Agni and Savitar, as for waters, plants, herbs and amulets as well. It may demonstrate that they saw some similitude in both genera of beings. It might give us a lead for further interpretation.

3. About the content of the concept of *deva*, we find first of all times without number that the *devas give prosperity.* I have put together the terms we could catch with the idea of prosperity, as there are *subhūtam*, *gātu* "progress", *bhagam* "fortune", *puṣṭe ca poṣe ca* "prosperity and abundance". We found the following passages: 1,31,3: 2,34,2: 36,2: 3: 3,10,7: 20,5: 4,25,5: 5,11,11: 6,5,2: 40,2:. So we come across other expressions such as "favouring" or "granting"; in short every possible term expressing: to bestow gifts such as: wisdom, force, power, strength, hearing, sight, cf. 2,17,1—6: 3,4,4: 6,111,4: 7,17,1: 19,1: 48,2: 76,6: 97,3: 11,2,28: 12,1,53: 19,43,2: 6: 43,1: 64,1:[2]).

Another aspect may be "to bestow property or well-being", cf. 5,3,5: 6,79,1: 3: 7,9,2: 14,1: 17,1: 33,1: 40,2: 46,1: 68,1: 3: 19,3,2: 3: 64,2:.

It is to be understood that a country always plagued by famine considers the bestowal of food the greatest gift and so they call the *devāsas viśvadhāyasas* "all-nourishing" (3,22,2:). They call their *devas*: *mayobhū* "giver of joy; refreshing" (5,17,1:). They even dare to ask evil *pāpman* to show this virtue of kindness (6,26,1). The undercurrent of this request is that evil may not visit the one who prays. The *devas* are often mentioned as giving *abhaya* "security" (6,40,1:) which we might have to consider as: having nothing to fear and so more like protection than audacity. *Viśvarādhasas devāsas* (7,17,2) "all [illegible] one (7,48,1: 2:).

The *devas* are called "givers of kine and progeny", of "protection" and "husbands" of "wives". We shall speak about them under their own headings.

4. *Amṛta* "full span of life, non-dying, vitality" cfr. chapter I. Sometimes there might occur a slight *confusion* between *amṛta* as the gift of vitality and *amṛta* as potion. But even then we see this beverage as a giver, a bestower of vitality. If we use the term "immortality" it is meant in the sense of "full span of life" etc.

There occur the following aspects:

were born themselves. We *may* add that "the olden times" always and everywhere receive a wide reverence among nations, as what is old, proved its value and is an example for later coming periods.

Only a few times, not worth mentioning, *one finds devas referred* to as a group and even so they do not reveal their inmost nature, which is after all the aim of this research.

2. We often find *deva* as an adjective and then also transformed into *daiva(ī)* and employed in such a way as to suggest exaggeration. One could not help finding this use very important as it shows how easily the term *deva* or *daivī* has been used as a very fashionable word. Though shrinking from attributing to *deva* the epithet of "fashion word" one really receives the impression that in the AV. *deva* and *daivī* was *very widely used, and that surely in connexion with the magical* sphere of the AV. Thus we meet a goat called *deva aja ekapād* (19,11,3:) Oldenberg (o.c., p. 70) refers to this mysterious being: "Der Ziegenbock wird als Träger aller Wesenheiten, als Stütze von Himmel und Erde beschrieben; er scheint mit seinem einen Fusz *ekapād* als eine Art tierisch-dämonischer Säule gedacht, auf der das Universum ruht". And Dumont makes an incidental suggestion that Pūṣan may be connected with this god: "if the god Aja Ekapād is a sun god, he perhaps has some connection with the God Pūṣan. I think that possibly the Vedic God Pūṣan, the god who is called the glowing one and who is the husband of the sun-maiden Sūryā, the god who preserves cattle, who is the guardian of the roads and is invoked as a guide, the god, whose chariot is drawn by goats and to whom the goat is consecrated originally was the same as Aja Ekapād, the vegetation spirit identified with the sun and conceived in a goat's shape".

After all AV. is a compilation from several sources. There would be no improbability in accepting that for several powers the compilers had different names in different parts of India and even before their invasion into India.

In 8,5,20: we meet amulets that are called *deva*, and 6,136,1: gives this tribute to a hair-restorer. In 19,39,6: the *aśvattha* is called *devasadana* whereas in 16,2,6: a mustard seed receives this exalted title and 6,92,3: *deva* occurs with a steed. So the adjective *devī* is very often attributed to *āpas* "the waters" 1,6,1: 3,12,5: 13,3: 6,23,1: and 16,1,13:. Parts of the cow are identical with several *devas* (9,7,1: 16: 24:). And the sun has to be seen as a *deva* cf. 13,2,8: 4,4: and 13,2,25: calls the sun *devānām adhipatiḥ*. In this same passage the earth receives the very same title. In these contexts one does not feel inclined to take the adjective use of *deva* (viz. *daivī*) too seriously. Still there is no need to condemn the Indians for exaggeration

as it is in use from olden times with every kind of tongue and people. [illegible] "exaggeration", [illegible] t is not without [illegible] for well known characters as Agni and Savitar, as for waters, plants, herbs and amulets as well. It may demonstrate that they saw some similitude in both genera of beings. It might give us a lead for further interpretation.

3. About the content of the concept of *deva*, we find first of all times without number that the *devas give prosperity*. I have put together the terms we could catch with the idea of prosperity, as there are *subhūtam*, *gātu* "progress", *bhagam* "fortune", *puṣṭe ca poṣe ca* "prosperity and abundance". We found the following passages: 1,31,3: 2,34,2: 36,2: 3: 3,10,7: 20,5: 4,25,5: 5,11,11: 6,5,2: 40,2:. So we come across other expressions such as "favouring" or "granting"; in short every possible term expressing: to bestow gifts such as: wisdom, force, power, strength, hearing, sight, cf. 2,17,1—6: 3,4,4: 6,111,4: *7,17,1: 19,1: 48,2: 76,6: 97,3: 11,2,28: 12,1,53: 19,43,2: 6: 43,1: 64,1:* [5]).

Another aspect may be "to bestow property or well-being", cf. 5,3,5: 6,79,1: 3: 7,9,2: 14,1: 17,1: 33,1: 40,2: 46,1: 68,1: 3: 19,3,2: 3: 64,2:.

It is to be understood that a country always plagued by famine considers the bestowal of food the greatest gift and so they call the *devāsas viśvadhāyasas* "all-nourishing" (3,22,2:). They call their *devas: mayobhū* "giver of joy; refreshing" (5,17,1:). They even dare to ask evil *pāpman* to show this virtue of kindness (6,26,1). The undercurrent of this request is that evil may not visit the one who prays. The *devas* are often mentioned as giving *abhaya* "security" (6,40,1:) which *we might have to* consider as: having nothing to fear and *so* more like protection than audacity. *Viśvarādhasas* [illegible] (7,17,3:) "all [illegible] (6,40,1: 2:).

The *devas* are called "givers of kine and progeny", of "protection" and "husbands" of "wives". We shall speak about them under their own headings.

4 *Amṛta* "full span of life, non-dying, vitality" cfr. chapter I. Sometimes there might occur a slight confusion between *amṛta* as the gift of vitality and *amṛta* as potion. But even then we see this beverage as a giver, a bestower of vitality. If we use the term "immortality" it is meant in the sense of "full span of life" etc.

There occur the following aspects:

a) *Apsv antar amṛtam* (1,4,4:): "Immortality housed in the waters"; 18,1,32: speaks about the *devasya amṛtam*; cf. also 3,13,6:.

b) elsewhere we find the *devas* mentioned as the "immortal ones" (*amartyāḥ*); cf. 1,31,1: 4,37,12: 6,41,3: 10,3,25: 13,1,44: 18,3,53:. Agni is also repeatedly called immortal cf. 7,84,1: and 8,2,13:. We find Indra and Agni mentioned as "immortal" 9,3,19: and Rudra 11,2,3:.

c) *Devas* defend *amṛta* as their stronghold: *devā iva amṛtaṃ rakṣamāṇāḥ* (3,30,7:) and apparently 14,1,64: alludes to the same, cf. also 5,28,11:.

d) *Devas* have not always been "immortal". They discovered immortality (13,1,7:) and they have attained it once upon a time (2,1,5:). And 19,19,10: suggested something quite different from the *devas* as a being called "the immortal". They wrapped themselves into "it" cf. 7,17,3:.

e) How did they attain this immortality? 4,35,6: tells us that by an offering of rice *amṛta* came into being: *yasmāt pakvād amṛtaṃ saṃ babhūva*. Several other places likewise suggest that the *devas* received it from a certain plant "*kuṣṭha*" cf. 5,4,3: 4: and 6,95,2:. This *kuṣṭha* has a double epithet: *puṣpa amṛtasya* and *sadana devānām* "seat of the *devas*".

f) Who is the distributor of *Amṛta?*
6,1,3: suggests Savitar and 19,64,4: Agni. However 19,43,7: mentions the waters. And again other passages suggest the stars (6,121,3:).

g) We get the impression that sowehow and somewhere *amṛta* has been looked upon as a personality [a]) in itself or that one saw a being, invested with immortality, as its essence. It is what von Glasenapp calls in his Entwicklungsstufen des Indischen Denkens: "Daseinsmächte". See 19,19,10: "The gods ascended with the immortal", and 6,26,3: says the immortal one to be thousand-eyed. Again 7,47,2: suggests Kuhū to be *devānām amṛtasya patnī*, so we have to see in this case *amṛta* as a person different from *devānām*. Something similar we might trace in 6,44,3: yet 14,1,61: tells us about the world of "the immortal".

One question is still open: when we hear Sarasvatī named *śilu* "youngster" (7,57,2:) and Agni *yahva* "id." cf. 5,12,3· 29,4: 8,3,8: 19,64,2: and Indra *yuvā* "young man" (6,2,3:) or "longlived" (6,98,2:) and again *āyuṣmant* in 6,47,2: 98,2: one might conclude that these terms "long-living" and "young" are a kind of synonym for "immortal", suggesting by different wording the same idea: "extremely vital".

5. The *devas* did not always have this high dignity of *devahood*. Has 2,1,5: already taught us that the *devas* reached *amṛta*, so 3,22,3: teaches us that: *yena devā devatām agra āyan* "the devas came once upon a time to devahood". This *agre* had the content of: before historical times, even before time began. Prof. Gonda in his Inleiding tot het Indische denken *) says: "dit "in den beginne" brengt ons buiten het empirische universum, buiten ons tijdsbegrip, het behoort tot een andere realiteit dan de onze (het woord dat wij aldus vertalen, heeft eigenlijk locale betekenis: op de spits, aan het uiteinde: agre) maar leeft tevens in de onze"... So 4,14,1: the goat was born from Agni's heat and *tena* "by means of him (fire)" *devā devatām agra āyan*. Agre suggests at least "long, long ago" but nevertheless, it has been recorded by Vedic history. Cf. 4,14,1: 4,23,6: Agni has been the person *yena devā amṛtam anvavindan*. By which, however, I should not like to state that immortality and devahood are identical. But the second part of the same quotation says: "by whom the *devas* brought heaven", *yena devāḥ svar ābharan*. And this is a fact, that the *devas* have heaven as their home. But also from elsewhere we receive proofs that the *devas* have become what they are and have not been *devas* from all eternity. 10,9,11: speaking about the cow, she is called the divine throughout the entire 9th sūkta; and stanza 11 says: "the divine one will go to the gods" *devān devī*. "She is going to the sky and heaven." 10,10,6: "having Parjanya as *pati*, she goes to the *devas*". And again 10,10,26: she is called *amṛta* and is worshipped by *devas*, *manuṣyas*, *asuras*, *pitaras*, *ṛṣayas*. And 5,17,5: "he becomes a limb of the gods" *sa devānām bhavaty ekam aṅgam*.

As far as I can see this "going to" means: "becoming" — just as going to heaven means to take the place of *devas* and so men are on an equal footing with *devas*. This surely suggests a certain content of thought in *deva*, hinting at least at something that is very great, supreme and exalted.

6. The Wisdom of the *devas*.

The AV. acknowledges the wisdom of the *devas* everywhere. They are wise, intelligent, knowing: *vidvān*. They know the ways of the devas: *vidvān vayunāni devānām*: 2,28,2: cf. also 3,1,1: 2: 2,1: 4,16,1: 39,10: 5,30,14: 6,67,3: 19,59,3:.

Elsewhere they are characterized as a group or as individuals: *medhām viduḥ*: "they know wisdom", cf. 6,108,3: or they are working with knowledge or they know: *cikituṣi* cf. 7,47,2:.

Of course we find other terms for wise such as: *prajñan* 3,12,4: 5,29,5: 7,9,1: 14,1,59: or *pracetas* 4,32,5: 23,1: 5,12,1: 6,45,3: 53,1: 19,59,3:, cf. also 7,106,1: 8,3,8: 14,2,46:. *Pravidvān* 5,26,1: 3: 9:

6,45,3:. So, too, we come across the terms *sacetas* 1,30,2: 4,26,1: 29,1: 6,68,1: and *sajoṣa* "unanimous" or "of the same knowledge", cf. 3,22,1: 6,115,1: or *sammanasaḥ* cf. 6,73,1: 74,3:.

We often find the gods called *kavi*, which is properly "the inspired one, poet", but surely with the undercurrent of "wise" cf. 4,1,7: 5,13,1: or *kavikratu* 7,14,1: or *sukratu* "of good insight" 7,14,2:. So we encounter *prathamadarśa* "knowledge that is penetrating (first sight)" and 6,93,3: tells us that Varuṇa is "of purified skill" *pūtadakṣāḥ*. I believe expressions like *sahasrākṣa:* thousand-eyed (4,20,4: 5: 28,3:) to have the same meaning "of thorough knowledge", just as 13,4,15: tells, about the sun, that he knows the *devas*.

We find mentioned the knowledge of *Varuṇa* cf. 5,11,4: 6,97,2: and *vipra* "wise" or "inspired" of Agni, cf. 6,27,2: 7,71,1:. Indra is called *vipra* 3,3,2: and another aspect of Varuṇa is: "the unerring one" *amura* (5,11,5:). Though we might encounter passages anywhere, where wisdom and intelligence of the *devas* is praised, they are still nowhere absolutely omniscient. We are able to trace some trends that show us that the Atharvavedic Indian did not believe in omniscience of his *devas*. *Devās te... avidan* "the devas come to know" (2,9,4:). With the help of a *brahmacārin deva* Bṛhaspati discovers his own wife (5,17,5:), and 7,89,2: is a prayer to Indra: "may the gods know me". 15,3,1: shows the *devas* asking the *vrātya* after his intention for his *tapas*. So 19,56,4: tells us that "the fathers nor the gods knew it, whose murmur goes about within here". We found this attribution of vast knowledge to the *devas* in the RV. and we shall find this everywhere, but nowhere did it become a conviction that the *devas* were omniscient. Everywhere in RV. and AV. and also in Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, we are told of their knowledge and about the fact that sometimes the *devas* do not know important things or our innermost thoughts.

7. *Devas* and Sacrifice.

First of all we treat texts which show us that the *devas* have at least some connection with sacrifice: 1,20,1: 3,3,1: 10,11: 4,39,10: 7,54,1:.

b) The *devas* are invited to come to the rites: 1,7,3: 2,35,5: 5,8,3: 11,10,12: 14: 15: 19,3,1: 58,6:.

c) They try to further man's sacrifices and they are asked by human beings to do so cf. 5,12,1: 27,11: 12: 6,39,1:.

d) In prayers accompanying the holy rites, *devas* are requested to accept the offerings: *prati gṛhṇāhi no haviḥ* cf. also 3,10,13: 19,27,11: 12: 13: 42,3: 58,6:. This acceptance may be the same as t o e a t those

offerings. Often the *devas* are asked to eat what the sacrificers offer here: *havir adantu devāḥ* cf. 5,12,11: 7,97,3: 18,3,42: 4,65:.

e) So we see that offerings are really intended for the *devas*, and it may be that this is the reason why sometimes the *devas* are called "carriers of sacrifice" (6,114,2:). Texts confirming that the offerings are for the *devas:* 1,31,1: 3,21,1: 4,21,3: 6,5,1:. Thus the *devas* are called *yajñiya* "worthy of sacrifice" cf. 2,12,2: 34,1: 6,55,3: 7,80,4: 97,2: 11,1,4: 14,2,10: 18,1,26:. However, we do not meet this expression as often as in the RV. But is not *yajatra* (6,114,2:) of the same meaning?

f) The *devas* like sacrifices: *devebhyo ... syonam* is said of the offerings cf. 5,12,4: 6,125,3: 7,28,1: 46,1: 47,2: 73,3: 77,1: 97,4: 103,1: 109,2: 5: 18,3,53:.

g) Agni, very often called *deva* himself, sacrifices to the *devas* cf. 5,12,1:, and so they call him: *yajīyān* "skilled sacrificer" (5,12,3: 9:). He is the priest of the *devas: brahman* 12,2,6: 7,62,1:, but also *openly hotā devānām cf.* also 2,28,2: 3,15,7: 20,5: 21,5: 6,71,1: 2: 123,2: 9,2,6: 10,9,26: 18,1,21: 19,59,3:. The *devas* themselves sometimes however, offer their own sacrifices cf. 7,5,3: 6,123,2: 19,6,10: 11:.

But Agni is also the priest of human beings and so they call him "the carrier of sacrifice" or they pray that he may carry the sacrifices of gods and men, cf. 5,8,1: 3: 12,2: 6,123,1: 7,20,7: 78,2: 82,1: 9,5,17: 12,2,8: 18,1,30: 2,34: 3,42: 4,41: 71: 19,4,1:. He too is the distributor of the offering to the *devas* 18,2,53: *and* so they praise him as the "best carrier" *vahiṣṭham* (4,23,3:) as he conveys the offerings to the gods (because of his being fire). We see *devas* and sacrifice in a most complicated situation. They accept offerings from human beings, and they sacrifice themselves too as we have noticed above. That is a problem nowhere solved, besides nowhere even felt as a problem. It seems that sacrifice is an action complete in itself.

h) Then AV. tells us: sacrifice is a means and weapon in the hands of the *devas:* by it they conquer the world 11,10,12:, they beat their enemies with it, 11,10,27: and they go to heaven by its strength 12,3,16:.

i) Moreover, sacrifice is higher than the *devas: yajñena yajñam ayajanta devās* "by the s. the gods sacrificed to the sacrifice" (7,5,1:) and the following stanza 2 says: Sacrifice *devānām adhipatir babhūva.* So 10,8,35 asks which were the *devas* that thought themselves higher than sacrifice itself? The answer "no one" is of course to be supplied to this question.

6,45,3:. So, too, we come across the terms *sacetas* 1,30,2: 4,26,1: 29,1: 6,68,1: and *sajoṣa* "unanimous" or "of the same knowledge", cf. 3,22,1: 6,115,1: or *saṃmanasaḥ* cf. 6,73,1: 74,3:.

We often find the gods called *kavi*, which is properly "the inspired one, poet", but surely with the undercurrent of "wise" cf. 4,1,7: 5,13,1: or *kavikratu* 7,14,1: or *sukratu* "of good insight" 7,14,2:. So we encounter *prathamadarśa* "knowledge that is penetrating (first sight)" and 6,93,3: tells us that Varuṇa is "of purified skill" *pūtadakṣāḥ*. I believe expressions like *sahasrākṣa:* thousand-eyed (4,20,4: 5: 28,3:) to have the same meaning "of thorough knowledge", just as 13,4,15: *tells, about the sun, that he knows the devas.*

We find mentioned the knowledge of *Varuṇa* cf. 5,11,4: 6,97,2: and *vipra* "wise" or "inspired" of Agni, cf. 6,27,2: 7,71,1:. Indra is called *vipra* 3,3,2: and another aspect of Varuṇa is: "the unerring one" *amura* (5,11,5:). *Though we might encounter passages any*where, where wisdom and intelligence of the *devas* is praised, they are still nowhere absolutely omniscient. We are able to trace some trends that show us that the Atharvavedic Indian did not believe in omniscience of his *devas*. *Devās te ... avidan* "the devas come to know" (2,9,4:). With the help of a *brahmacārin deva* Bṛhaspati discovers his own wife (5,17,5:), and 7,89,2: is a prayer to Indra: "may the gods know me". 15,3,1: shows the *devas* asking the *vrātya* after his intention for his *tapas*. So 19,56,4: tells us that "the fathers nor the gods knew it, whose murmur goes about within here". We found this attribution of vast knowledge to the *devas* in the RV. and we shall find this everywhere, but nowhere did it become a conviction that the *devas* were omniscient. Everywhere in RV. and AV. and also in Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, we are told of their knowledge and about the fact that sometimes the *devas* do not know important things or our innermost thoughts.

7. *Devas* and Sacrifice.

First of all we treat texts which show *us that the devas have at* least some connection with sacrifice: 1,20,1: 3,3,1: 10,11: 4,39,10: 7,54,1:.

b) The *devas* are invited to come to the rites: 1,7,3: 2,35,5: 5,8,3: *11,10,12: 14: 15: 19,3,1: 58,6:.*

c) They try to further man's sacrifices and they are asked by human beings to do so cf. 5,12,1: 27,11: 12: 6,39,1:.

d) In prayers accompanying the holy rites, *devas are requested to* accept the offerings: *prati gṛhṇāhi no haviḥ* cf. also 3,10,13: 19,27,11: 12: 13: 42,3: 58,6:. This acceptance may be the same as t o e a t those

6,40,2: and rescue cf. 6,53,1: 2: 96,1: "tie the enemies" 6,103,1: 104,1: "unfasten the bonds" cf. 6,111,1: 117,1: 119,2: 133,1: and so we find other places as well: cf. 11,6,4: 7: 12: 18: 19: 18,3,25: 19,42,3: 10,10: etc.

2) protection by burning someone i.e. the demons cf. 6,32,1: 34,2: 8,4,1:.

3) protection by killing the opponents cf. 3,1,1—6: 6,2:[8]). The *devas* are called "foe-destroyers" *riśādasaḥ* cf. 7,77,1:, and *pṛtanāṣāṭ* "overpowerer of fighters"; cf. 5,14,8: 21,11: 7,63,1:. And also "rakṣas-killer" *rakṣohan*: cf. 1,28,1: 16,1: 4,23,3: 7,71,1:.

4) protection by confounding enemies, cf. 3,1,1—6: 2,1: 3: 6,32,3: 67,2:.

5) protection by warding off hostile powers cf. 6,85,1: 2: 97,2: 3: 10,3,2: 5:.

6) protection by confounding people cf. 6,130,4:

7) protection by carrying "evils" *ripra* away cf. 6,51,2: 16,6,11:.

8) some of the *devas* are called "man-watcher" *nṛcakṣaḥ* (Agni and Varuna) cf. 1,7,5: 4,16,7: 29,2: 7,110,2: 8,3,9: 17: 17,1,30: and also guardian cf. 11,1,33: or *gopā* cf. 5,3,2: and "overseer" cf. 5,3,1: 6,34,4:. Afterwards we shall see that hand in hand with this strong belief in the protection and protective powers of the *devas* goes a great faith in their might and influence upon the forces of nature and foes.

9. The *devas* have healing power.

Agni is often honoured with [illegible]
cures [illegible]
Savit[illegible]
and 2[illegible]
4,13,[illegible] the epithet of *viśvabheṣaja* "all-healing". *Asura* is associated with *bheṣaja* 2,3,3: and 1,24,2: states *āsurī cakre prathamedaṃ kilāsabheṣajam idam* "the asura-woman first made this remedy for leprous spot". We hear the Aśvins as physicians 7,53,1:. Elsewhere we hear Agni invoked to throw out the diseases 1,28,1: *amīvacātanaḥ* cf. also 7,84,1: and 5,22,1:.

The waters also have this power (1,5,4: and 3,7,5:) and therefore receive the epithet of [illegible]

The *devas* prepa[illegible]
However, I do not [illegible] to accept this healing power of the *devas* as some special gift along with others. Far more I believe

j) 12,2,8: informs us: sacrifice is a god for the Gods cf. RV. 10,16,9: I found no more of these texts, maybe it is a truly exceptional one. However, it would not be at all surprising if the all-conquering power of sacrifice should be looked upon as a personal power. Thus the *Vanaspati* "the sacrificial tree" is looked upon as a power that drives away or at least is able to ward off the *piśācas* (12,3,15:). So we come across many more texts which certainly do imply a kind of personal influence or action. Still another question is, whether the Vedic Indian made a clear distinction between personal and impersonal [5]).

8. Another epithet or characteristic of *the devas is their readiness* to help. And at the same time the frequency with which the *devas* are invoked. One may look upon the AV. — and here it agrees with RV. — as a great prayerbook of requests for help, assistance and especially protection. We could split up this idea of helping into the following headings:

a) The *devas* are helping us 1,6,1: 3,12,5: 20,5: 6,108,2: 7,40,1:. They are favouring us or at least asked to do so. *Avantu viśve devāḥ* cf. 2,13,5: 3,19,5:. The Aśvins prepare the road (make it easy to go) 3,3,4: 15,5:, the *devas* with Indra as a chief go with the army (3,19,6:) and give their help. The Maruts are "helpful" *sagmā* (4,27,3:). The *devas* are our "allies" *saha devī* or *sajūs* 6,35,2: 59,2: 129,1: 7,50,4: *51,1: 13,1,3:, and they are asked for their help 7,49,1: 19,15,1: 24,7:* and 27,1: 2:.

b) Protection and assistance.
This aspect of the *devas'* power has been of the greatest influence on the Vedic mind. No request occurs so often as this prayer for help and protection, and this aspect is ever so varied. Protection in genere; we meet expressions and terms as *rakṣ* and *ārabh* "take hold of me" or *jāgrta* "be watchful, to be awake for protection". Every *deva*-personality is asked for protection: Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, the Maruts etc. cf. 1,19,1: 20,2: 3: 21,1: 30,1: 31,3: etc. [6]).

Other terms are *trāy* "to rescue" and synonyms and the great number of passages certainly shows us that the Indians saw in their *devas* a kind of "guardian-angels" to speak in more familiar terms; cf. 4,13,4: 6,3,1: 4,1: 27,1: 2: 3: 45,3: 56,1: 59,2: 93,3: 107,1: etc. [7]). The facts of this protection are important, as they show, what they expected by the grant and gift of protecting; what they really understood by their request for protection.

1) *pramuc* "to deliver", *including "to give progress, to release* from evil". We find cf. 2,34,2: 4: 3,11,1: freedom from foes: cf.

that the Indian thought and still thinks this power to afflict and cure to be a special aspect of the *devas'* protection against just another enemy, he has daily to cope with. Diseases are still in India the national enemy. No wonder they still look to the *devas* for their cures and healing.

10. As already has been suggested above, the basis of the Indian conviction that the *devas* are such powerful helpers and protectors is the strong belief that the *devas* are so powerful. We hear them mentioned as *ugra*: "formidable, strong". This term originally is the adjective belonging to the substantive *ojas*. And this *ojas* is often said to be "of divine origin" or "dependent on a divine power", and *ojas* comes from, or belongs to, heaven and earth.

Ugra itself denotes a characteristic or quality of a *deva*. It is used for Indra and Rudra as well. However we meet *ugram* also connected with the healing herb, in the meaning of powerful, potent, in a supranormal way, and so even men can be *ugra*. Anyhow *ojas* has to be a mysterious supranormal energy, especially as Indra strengthens himself by *ojas* cf. also RV. 8,36,3:. The term *ugra* is accompanied by words denoting Indra's excessive fondness for drinking soma. In short *ojas* seems to be a vital power and a powerful substance inherent in *devas* and divine beings [9]). This term is to be found in a number of places: 1,10,1: 2: 3,1,2: 16,2: 4,1,5: 19,8: 24,2: *(ugrabāhu)* 28,3: etc. [10]).

The *devas* are also called "mighty" with many different words. "Husband of might" *śacipati* cf. 6,82,3· 7,25,1: 54,2: 11,9,23: 13,4,47:.

So *vibhu* "powerful and vigorous", 4,23,4: 6,33,2· 3: 124,1: 125,3: 7,63,1: 8,3,22: 11,1,6: 18,3,54:. And we encounter in 1,35,2: *devānām ojaḥ prathamajam hi etat* cf. also 7,53,2: 11,10,12:. So too we hear the *devas* called 6,107,1: *viśvajit* "all-conqueror" and Pūṣan: "embryo slayer" (6,112,3:) and Soma "lord of fighters" (7,81,3). Indra who is the bridegroom of *śacī* "might" cf 6,82,3: 11,9,23: 13,4,47: is also called with other names; among others we like to quote: c) *adhirāja* cf. 6,98,2 19,46,4:

and d) *sarvavid* "all-gaining" cf. 17,1,11 . He is "powerful" *śakra* cf. 7,86,1: 8,4,21: 13,4,47:, he is the "overcomer of heaven" *svarjit* cf. 17,1,1: and also *jetā*, *īśāna* cf. 6,2,3: and *grāmajit* cf. 6,97,3:. Other epithets are *gojit* cf. 5,3,11 6,97,3 *dhanajit* cf. 5,3,11: and *dhanapati* cf. 5,23,2: and 5,3,11: praises him as *alvajit*.

e) The *devas* are lauded for their strength *vājin* cf. 3,20,7 and 4,38,6: 7: and because of their strength and weapons they are such great heroes *vīra* and *vīrya* cf. 1,7,5: 2,5,1: 7,76,6: 86,1: 31,1: and also as *śūra* cf. 8,8,7: 18,1,38:. Indra is armed with the *vajra*, he is

vajrin cf. 7,110,1: 2: 18,1,37: cf. chapter I. Other adjectives expressing their strength: *isubhrtām asiṣṭhau* "best shooters" cf. 4,28,2, and *tanūpā* "selfprotecting" cf. 6,41,3:.

11. Connected with this power for protection is the kindness of the gods, their friendship with which they are always ready to help. They are "friends" *mitra* cf. 11,9,2: 1,26,2: *mitramahas* cf. 5,12,1:. They are "easily invoked": Anumati 7,20,4:. They are ready to help and benevolent cf. 7,14,1: 31,1: 74,4: 19,55,3: and also 6,55,3:, they are bounteous and Indra has *maghavan(t)* as one of his personal titles, a kind of name: cf. 3,1,3: 19,6: 6,58,1: 31,1: 8,4,19: 7,50,4: 86,1: 18,1,38: 19,15,1: so he is called *sudānu* "liberal" cf. 7,20,4: and 18,3,61:. However he is able to be liberal and to give, for he is very rich cf. 7,12,1: 91,1: 92,1: and he is praised as *dhanamjayo* cf. 3,14,2:.

So Agni and others are called "lord of treasures" cf. 7,17,4: 19,1: 50,3: 62,1: and the *devas* are "all-possessing" *viśvavedas* (6,92,1:) or *sarvavid* (6,107,4:).

12. We now come to other sorts of epithets from which I believe we can easily conclude that the Atharvaveda did not regard the *devas* as spirits. They are bound to certain regions and they have their own domains. And these regions of the *devas* are certainly not only to be found in heaven *divi* or in the sky *vyoman* cf. 18,4,30:, but also on the earth, in the firmament and even in the herbs and plants cf. 1,30,3: 33,3: 10,9,12: 11,1,37: 6,13: 12: 12,1,20: 2,12: 17,1,13: 19,27,11: 12: 13:.

We read in several places that the *devas* have heaven as their residence *deva te sadhastam* cf. 2,2,1: and 18,3,22: or also *divi spṛṣṭaḥ* (2,2,2:), all *devas* live above, as they have to come "from above" for partaking in sacrifices; cf. 8,8,13:.

ṛc is identified with the highest firmament cf. 9,10,18: and so the seat of the *devas*. The *devas* live there together *devas savāsinau* 3,29,6:. Sometimes we find that the gods are living in a certain part of the body of some *yakṣa* cf. 10,7,13: 27: or in the breast of the yellow swan cf. 10,8,18: and 13,2,38:. The *devas* live in the cow "much honoured" (10,10,5:), or in the breast of someone not easily to determine "the sun" cf. 13,2,38: 3,14:. Anyhow the Indian does not see the *devas* as pure spirits without any relation to place or material. Viṣṇu for instance traversed the spaces (7,26 [illegible], he and Varuna estab[illegible]
(or five) regions of [illegible]
they are called c[illegible]
2,10,4: the *pradiś* [illegible] themselves are named *devas*. [illegible] In we see the *lokapālas* without this special name 3,26,1: etc. 27,1: etc.

that the Indian thought and still thinks this power to afflict and cure to be a special aspect of the *devas*' protection against just another enemy, he has daily to cope with. Diseases are still in India the national enemy. No wonder they still look to the *devas* for their cures and healing.

10. As already has been suggested above, the basis of the Indian conviction that the *devas* are such powerful helpers and protectors is the strong belief that the *devas* are so powerful. We hear them mentioned as *ugra*: "formidable, strong". This term originally is the adjective belonging to the substantive *ojas*. And this *ojas* is often said to be "of divine origin" or "dependent on a divine power", and *ojas* comes from, or belongs to, heaven and earth.

Ugra itself denotes a characteristic or quality of a *deva*. It is used for Indra and Rudra as well. However we meet *ugram* also connected with the healing herb, in the meaning of powerful, potent, in a supranormal way, and so even men can be *ugra*. Anyhow *ojas* has to be a mysterious supranormal energy, especially as Indra strengthens himself by *ojas* cf. also RV. 8,36,3:. The term *ugra* is accompanied by words denoting Indra's excessive fondness for drinking soma. In short *ojas* seems to be a vital power and a powerful substance inherent in *devas* and divine beings [9]). This term is to be found in a number of places: 1,10,1: 2: 3,1,2: 16,2: 4,1,5: 19,8: 24,2: *(ugrabāhu)* 28,3: etc. [10]).

The *devas* are also called "mighty" with many different words. "Husband of might" *śacipati* cf. 6,82,3: 7,25,1: 54,2: 11,9,23: 13,4,47:.

So *vibhu* "powerful and vigorous", 4,23,4: 6,33,2: 3: 124,1: 125,3: 7,63,1: 8,3,22: 11,1,6: 18,3,54:. And we encounter in 1,35,2: *devānām ojaḥ prathamajaṃ hi etat cf. also 7,53,2: 11,10,12:.* *So too we hear* the *devas* called 6,107,1: *viśvajit* "all-conqueror" and Pūsan: "embryo slayer" (6,112,3:) and Soma "lord of fighters" (7,81,3·). *Indra who is the bridegroom of śaci "might" cf. 6,82,3:* 11,9,23: 13,4,47: is also called with other names; among others we like to quote: c) *adhirāja* cf. 6,98,2 19,46,4:

and d) sarvavid "all-gaining" cf. 17,1,11·. *He is* "powerful" *śakra* cf. 7,86,1: 8,4,21: 13,4,47:, he is the "overcomer of heaven" *svarjit* cf. 17,1,1: and also *jetā, īśāna* cf. 6,2,3: and *grāmajit* cf. 6,97,3:. Other epithets are *gojit* cf. 5,3,11· 6,97,3: *dhanajit* cf. 5,3,11: and *dhanapati* cf. 5,23,2: and 5,3,11: praises him as *aścajit*.

e) The *devas* are lauded for their strength *vājin* cf. 3,20,7· and 4,38,6: 7: and because of their strength and weapons they are such great heroes *vīra* and *vīrya* cf. 1,7,5: 2,5,1: 7,76,6: 86,1: 31,1: and also as *śūra* cf. 8,8,7: 18,1,38:. Indra is armed with the *vajra*, he is

gods worship breath *prāṇaṃ devā upāsate* (11,4,11:). So also trees, herbs, plants, Gandharvas and Apsarases, serpents, *devas*, pure folks and fathers in 11,9,24:. Even the forest tree receives the title of *deva* cf. 12,3,32: 33:. One may even feel inclined to believe that 8,10,18 ff: teach us a scale of values cf. 8,10,21: 22: 23: men, *asuras*, fathers; 8,10,18: 19: 20: forest tree, fathers, *devas;* 24: to men, 25: to the seven *ṛṣis;* 26: to *devas* Indra and Savitar, 27: to Gandharvas and Apsarases, 28: itarajana "other folks", 29: to serpents. Also cf. 17,1,2—5: and 19,62,1: 19,70,1:.

In 6,30,1: we see, that the *devas* plough. Still, 7,105,1:, used in the *upanayana* ceremony as the teacher takes his pupil by the arm and places him facing eastwards, teaches us the difference between *devas* and human beings. However the AV. just like RV. and other Vedic books show us very human qualities.

17. To start with 7,77,3: the Maruts are called *mānuṣa*. They tortured human beings when they are requested to injure us. cf. 8,2,9: 21: 12,2,50: 4,6: 12: 18,4.30:, their demands are cruel cf. 16,7,2:. Therefore we need protection cf. 12,2,44: where the *devas* are asked to hide and conceal us against evil. cf. also 8,3,14:. Even the plants give [illegible]
mag [illegible]
Agn [illegible] that Agni pacifies the *devas*. Even the *devas* molest each other cf. 13,1,40.

Quite a number of less honourable qualities we find mentioned in AV. They call some of the devas *klanda* "noisy" (2,2,5:) i.e. the Gandharvas and Apsarases or "dusk" *tamiṣīci* cf. 2,2,5: and both these epithets mean in everyday life: low. They are mentioned as *akṣakāma* "dice-loving" and *manomuh* "mind-confusing" cf. 2,2,5:. There also they are addicted to drink, they are drinkers of soma *pibā sutasya* or *somapā* cf. 1,21,2: 2,5,1: 12,3: 5: 6,2,3: 7,58,1:. And one might suggest that this draught is strengthening and not alcoholic in the usual sense, but we quote: "O Indra, enjoy thou, drive on; come on hero, with thy two bays: drink of the pressed soma, intoxicated here, loving the [illegible]
tion". *Indra juṣa*
iha madhoi cak [illegible]
strongly intoxic[illegible] effect of the soma-drink, cf. my note in chapter I, p. 20. King Soma stole a brahmin's wife and handed her back, Mitra Varuṇa and Agni conducted her hither, seizing her hand cf. 5,17,2 ff:.

18. The AV. gives a clear insight into the relation between *Asuras*

13. Another "duty" of the *devas*, especially Agni's, is that of *dūta* "messenger" cf. 1,7,6: 3,2,1: 4,3: 4,13,3: 5,12,1: etc. We must view this aspect of Agni and Vāta in connection with the office of being a priest for human and divine beings so that their task of messenger will mean that they are carriers of offerings.

14. Generally speaking the Indians did not recognize any omniscience or omnipresence in their *devas* and no omniperfection either. They are still "growing in power" *vṛdh* cf. 1,29,1: 3: 2,6,1: 6,5,3: 7,29,2: "by good praise", 14,1,37: "they grow by water and honey", cf. also 15,1,4: 5: 17,1,14: 18,3,22:. Elsewhere we read that they increase *pravṛddha* cf. 4,26,2: 5,28,4:. They increase and grow by the help of the ancestors and fathers cf. 18,1,47: and so we hear too that: 1,8,4 *brahmaṇā vāvṛdhānaḥ* "Agni grows by liturgical acts". Elsewhere we read (18,1,33:) that the songs of praise *śloka* are a spell over them.

15. A few adjectives not so frequently used for the *devas*, but still showing the great respect of the Indians for his *devas*: *parameṣṭhin* and the like "exalted one" (1,7,2: 18,1,34:) *vandita* "revered one" (1,7,1:) *bhadra* "excellent" (3,13,5:). In short they believed very strongly in the importance of the favour of the *devas* cf. 6,47,2: 7,97,2: etc. and in practically every hymn this conviction speaks explicitly or implicitly.

16. Reading through the entire AV. we found nowhere explained the distinction between *devas*, *asuras*, and human beings as essential or substantial. We find them mentioned one after the other, so that we doubt whether the authors see any real difference between *devas*, *asuras*, *manuṣyas*, where sometimes *ṛṣis* may be found as added cf. 4,16,8: 28,5: 30,3: 8,9,24: 10,9,9: 11,1,5: and 16: 12,2,17: 19,9,11:. So we find *brāhmaṇas*, *ṛṣis*, *devas* cf. 6,12,1: 13,1: 11,4,16: 5,1: 2: 3: 5: 19: and we come across godfolk, men, all beings 6,19,1:, and 6,20,2: however, is a sūkta pronounced in order to ward off fever, and therein we find Varuṇa on the same level as Rudra, fever, *antarikṣa* and *pṛthivī* "the earth". In 6,33,3: we meet Indra among people as the most powerful and again in 7,53,7: they pray: "that they — *devaṃ devatrā* — have highest brightness". 8,8,15: shows Gandharvas, Apsarases, serpents, *devas*, *puṇyajana* "pure folks" renders Whitney, and fathers, all on the same level. The *devas* and the fathers are practically of the same importance cf. 6,123,3: 11,8,29:, even the cows (called *devī* as well) cf. 7,75,2:. So the "priests" *ṛtvij*, who are the *devas* cf. 8,9,21: 19,11,5: 58,6: 62,1:. So we find breath and the *devas* mentioned together cf. 11,4,16: where even the

As we mentioned above the Indians did not think their *devas* to be pure spirits. Whatever they might be, they behave like human beings. They come into being through father, mother and their wives cf. 2,1,3: 5,11,11: 6,38,1: 81,3: 7,2,1: 46,3: 47,2: 49,1: 2: 80,3: 18,1,25: 31: 19,53,8: 57,3: 58,6:. And 2,1,3: speaks about *nāmadha* "father" as acknowledger of his children.

There are "sons" cf. 1,30,2. 3,10,13: 6,1,1: 58,3: 7,2,1: and there are "daughters" cf. 3,31,5: 6,82,2: 100,3: and "sisters" cf. 5,5,1: 6,46,2: 100,3: and other relations as well *bandhu* cf. 5,11,11: 7,2,1: and implicitly the same is said in 4,1,6: *eṣa jajñe bahubhiḥ sākam itthā* "he was born together with many thus".

They came into being by birth cf. 1,7,6: 33,1: (Savitar) 3,20,1: "by way of a yoni" 4,1,3: 6: 23,4: 5,4,7: 6,34,5 (Agni) and Indra and others in 7,84,2: 11,8,3: 19,3,1: 6,16:. Births are mentioned in 2,28,2: 4,1,3: 13,3,21: 18,3,23:. Somehow the birth of the *devas* is a bit particular cf. 4,11,6:. And so along the family line clans have formed themselves *daivir viśaḥ* cf. 9,4,9: *devajana* 11,9,2: 11,9,5: 26: 10,5: 13,3,20: 15,3,10:. Some passages named the *devas tapojā* "born from tapas" or 19,10,2: occurs "often-born". They make a difference between younger and older, *kāmā* was first-born 9,2,19:, and elsewhere Agni is the "young one" *yuvā* and also Sarasvatī *śiśu*.

And even intercourse is related to between the *devas* in 14,2,32:. Quite openly is revealed that lust and desire for children is part of their lives cf. 6,81,3:. Aditi desires a son; 9,2,19: *kāma* "lust" was first born, cf. also 19,4,4: 52,3:.

Kāma is called "mighty" (19,52,1—5:), "shining" *vibhāvan*, "formidable" *ugra* and overpowering, but interestingly nowhere *deva*. So quite clearly AV. shows us that there is no question of self-sufficiency in being; they really *came* into existence cf. 15,14,1—11:.

Concluding we do not see that the Indians thought anything special of the birth of the *devas*. They even do not appeal to a particular way of delivery except, 4,11,6: *Yena devāḥ svar āruruhur hitvā śarīram* [illegible]

any problem in it and did not need any super-natural way for the *devas*. He did not even express the conviction that the *devas* were in origin absolutely different from us.

20. Speaking about Varuṇa as *rājā*, we find this title often also with other *devas* e.g. 4,1,5: Bṛhaspati *samrāṭ*: 5,24,1—14: *adhipatis* cf. also 6,10,1—3: Agni 6,36,3: further other *devas* cf. 6,86,2: 3: 119,1: 123,5:. We meet Indra, often called *viśāmpati* (1,21,1:) especially Soma has the title of King in the AV. cf. 3,20,4: 6,99,3:

and *devas*, but this clear insight has been confused sometimes by lack of knowledge of the age of several passages in the AV. and also by lack of real knowledge of the historical or political background of some Atharvavedic texts. And especially here, where it refers to the relaton between *asuras* and *devas*, we are *really* at a complete loss to understand what *asuras* were in reality or were in the minds of the Indians. Some places tell us, that the *asuras* were governing the *devas*. Their king is Varuṇa and he rules over *Asuras* and *devas* as well cf. 1,10,1:. Varuṇa is called here *ayaṁ devānāṁ asuraḥ*, which implies that Varuṇa is an *asura* par excellence and reigns *rājati* over both of them cf. 5,11,1: *mahe Asurāya*. Varuṇa has the title of king *rājā* or *rājate* throughout the entire AV. cf. 1,10,1: 33,2[21]). Yet Varuṇa is called *mahādeva* and *rājā* 5,21,11: and 6,51,3: gives him the title of *deva* cf. also 1,10,1: 5,11,11:. All this could imply that *devas* and *asuras* were synonyms or different titles for groups of the same beings. But other texts, I should say, force us to accept a real difference. We refer to our RV. chapter; some traits, though, are far more widely treated in this AV. part. So 15,2,2—4: implies a certain difference by mentioning the ādityas (elsewhere usually named *asuras*) next to the group of *devas*. So 6,109,3: where totally opposite actions are told about *asuras* and *devas*, implying a kind of opposition and counteracting. 6,141,3: could point to the same, but is not strictly convincing. 3,9,4: *devā ivāsuramāyayā* "go ye about like gods with *asura* magic" implying *asuras* to be a bit more important or mightier than the *devas*. 19,56,3: gives a much clearer discrimination. 4,8,3: tells us so impressively about *Asura* (probably Varuṇa) as never in connection with any *deva*: *mahat tad vṛṣṇo asurasya nāmā viśvarūpo amṛtāni tasthau* "great is the name of the virile *Asura*: having all forms, he approached to immortal beings". 4,15,12: calls Varuṇa *asuraḥ pitā*.

And throughout the entire AV. Varuṇa retains this position of king and exalted *asura*, though the *asuras* as group are losing theirs. It is not the king that gets destroyed but his subjects and he will have afterwards the same kingly place with his former enemies, the *devas*. 2,27,3: 4: *Indro ha cakre tvā bāhāv asurebhyo starītave* "Indra put thee on his arm, in order to lay low the *asuras*" and 6,7,3 asks: *yena devā asurāṇām ojāṁsy avṛṇudhvam* "By what, O *devas*, did you repel the might of the asura"; cf. also 12,1,5 and in 8,6,5: the *asuras* take the same position as the *daevas* in Persia: they are black, hairy, snouted (*tuṇḍika*). The very same story we meet afterwards in Chāndogya Upaniṣad and Bṛhad Araṇyaka Upaniṣad, but there the treatment of the *asuras* is even worse and more contemptuous.

19. Sex relationship among the *devas*.

As we mentioned above the Indians did not think their *devas* to be pure spirits. Whatever they might be, they behave like human beings. They come into being through father, mother and their wives cf. 2,1,3: 5,11,11: 6,38,1: 81,3: 7,2,1: 46,3: 47,2: 49,1: 2: 80,3: 18,1,25: 31: 19,53,8: 57,3: 58,6:. And 2,1,3: speaks about *nāmadha* "father" as acknowledger of his children.

There are "sons" cf. 1,30,2. 3,10,13: 6,1,1: 58,3: 7,2,1: and there are "daughters" cf. 3,31,5: 6,82,2: 100,3: and "sisters" cf. 5,5,1: 6,46,2: 100,3: and other relations as well *bandhu* cf. 5,11,11: 7,2,1: and implicitly the same is said in 4,1,6: *eṣa jajñe bahubhiḥ sākam itthā* "he was born together with many thus".

They came into being by birth cf. 1,7,6: 33,1: (Savitar) 3,20,1: "by way of a yoni" 4,1,3: 6: 23,4: 5,4,7: 6,34,5 (Agni) and Indra and others in 7,84,2: 11,8,3: 19,3,1: 6,16:. Births are mentioned in 2,28,2: 4,1,3: 13,3,21: 18,3,23:. Somehow the birth of the *devas* is a bit particular cf. 4,11,6:. And so along the family line clans have formed themselves *daivīr viśaḥ* cf. 9,4,9: *devajana* 11,9,2: 11,9,5: 26: 10,5: 13,3,20: 15,3,10:. Some passages named the *devas tapojā* "born from tapas" or 19,10,2: occurs "often-born". They make a difference between younger and older, *kāmā* was first-born 9,2,19:, and elsewhere Agni is the "young one" *yuvā* and also Sarasvatī *śiśu*.

And even intercourse is related to between the *devas* in 14,2,32:. Quite openly is revealed that lust and desire for children is part of their lives cf. 6,81,3:. Aditi desires a son; 9,2,19: *kāma* "lust" was first born, cf. also 19,4,4: 52,3:.

Kāma is called "mighty" (19,52,1—5:), "shining" *vibhāvan*, "formidable" *ugra* and overpowering, but interestingly nowhere *deva*. So quite clearly AV. shows us that there is no question of self-sufficiency in being; they really *came* into existence cf. 15,14,1—11:.

Concluding we do not see that the Indians thought anything special of the birth of the *devas*. They even do not appeal to a particular way of delivery except, 4,11,6: *Yena devāḥ svar āruruhur hitvā śarīram amṛtasya nābhim*, but this single passage certainly does not prove that the Atharvavedic Indian knew about a supernatural birth just for the use of the gods. Even this might prove that the Indians never saw any problem in it and did not need any super-natural way for the *devas*. He did not even express the conviction that the *devas* were in origin absolutely different from us.

23. Speaking about Varuṇa as *rājā*, we find this title often also with other *devas* e.g. 4,1,5: Bṛhaspati *samrāṭ*: 5,24,1—14: *adhipatis* cf. also 6,10,1—3. Agni 6,36,3: further other *devas* cf. 6,86,2: 3: 119,1: 123,5:. We meet Indra, often called *viśāmpati* (1,21,1:) especially Soma has the title of King in the AV. cf. 3,20,4: 6,99,3:

and *devas*, but this clear insight has been confused sometimes by lack of knowledge of the age of several passages in the AV. and also by lack of real knowledge of the historical or political background of some Atharvavedic texts. And especially here, where it refers to the relaton between *asuras* and *devas*, we are *really* at a complete loss to understand what *asuras* were in reality or were in the minds of the Indians. Some places tell us, that the *asuras* were governing the *devas*. Their king is Varuṇa and he rules over *Asuras* and *devas* as well cf. 1,10,1:. Varuṇa is called here *ayaṃ devānām asuraḥ*, which implies that Varuṇa is an *asura* par excellence and reigns *rājati* over both of them cf. 5,11,1: *mahe Asurāya*. Varuṇa has the title of king *rājā* or *rājate* throughout the entire AV. cf. 1,10,1: 33,2 [11]). Yet Varuṇa is called *mahādeva* and *rājā* 5,21,11: and 6,51,3: gives him the title of *deva* cf. also 1,10,1: 5,11,11:. All this could imply that *devas* and *asuras* were synonyms or different titles for groups of the same beings. But other texts, I should say, force us to accept a real difference. We refer to our RV. chapter; some traits, though, are far more widely treated in this AV. part. So 15,2,2—4: implies a certain difference by mentioning the ādityas (*elsewhere usually named asuras*) *next to the* group of *devas*. So 6,109,3: where totally opposite actions are told about *asuras* and *devas*, implying a kind of opposition and counteracting. 6,141,3: could point to the same, but is not strictly convincing. 3,9,4: *devā ivāsuramāyayā* "go ye about like gods with *asura* magic" implying *asuras* to be a bit more important or mightier than the *devas*. 19,56,3: gives a much clearer discrimination. 4,8,3: tells us so impressively about *Asura* (probably Varuṇa) as never in connection with any *deva*: *mahat tad vṛṣṇo asurasya nāmā viśvarūpo amṛtāni tasthau* "great is the name of the virile *Asura*: having all forms, he approached to immortal beings". 4,15,12: calls Varuṇa *asuraḥ pitā*.

And throughout the entire AV. Varuṇa retains this position of king and exalted *asura*, though the *asuras* as group are losing theirs. It is *not the king that gets destroyed but his subjects and he will have* afterwards the same kingly place with his former enemies, the *devas*. 2,27,3: 4: *Indro ha cakre tvā bāhāv asurebhyo staritave* "Indra put thee on his arm, in order to lay low the *asuras*" and 6,7,3: asks: *yena devā asurāṇām ojāṃsy avṛṇidhvam* "By what, O *devas*, did you repel the might of the asura"; cf. also 12,1,5. and in 8,6,5: the *asuras* take the same position as the *daevas* in Persia: they are black, hairy, snouted (*tuṇḍika*). The very same story we meet afterwards in Chāndogya Upaniṣad and Bṛhad Araṇyaka Upaniṣad, but there the treatment of the *asuras* is even worse and more contemptuous.

19. Sex relationship among the *devas*.

100 "autumns or th[illegible]
"giving of long life". [illegible]
enemies[11]), or vahātha jarase "carry him to old age" [illegible]
and 5,30,14:. We do not hear them often ask for a long life, but for the "length of life". And this span of lifetime is reckoned nowadays to be about 120 years, as Mahâtmā Gandhi said about 6 weeks before his death.

They have power over sickness and death (2,12,4:) harasā daivyena cf. also 3,9,1:.

b) They have power over cattle cf. 2,26,1: 19,63,1: and Viṣṇu is called the "unhurtful shepherd" (7,26,5:). They even give "immortality" which means "the full span of life" 7,106,1: 118,1: cf. also 10,2,14:. They give to a man his wife cf. 3,25,6: 6,60,1: etc. (Aryaman) 82,2: 3: 2,30,2: (Aśvins) cf. also 6,130,1: etc. 131,1: etc. 14,1,50:; so they give a husband to a woman cf. 2,36,1: 3: and 14,2,1: and they are the creators of the body 10,2,4: 5: 8:.

c) The devas have authority and dominion over everything so e.g. āpas have mastery over every desirable thing cf. 1,5,4: īśānā vāryāṇām; the deeper meaning of 2,30,2: may be the same, where the Aśvins are said to be able to dispose of everything. 3,8,4: introduces the devas as the gopā "herdsmen and lords of prosperity". 3,8,1: says that the devas give "authority": bṛhad rāṣṭram … dadhātu and 6,87,1: introduces Indra in the same quality.

The devas rule the earth: bhūpati or bhuvanasya pati or bhūtapati cf. 1,31,1: 2,2,1: 2: 14,4: 3,10,9: 6,79,1: 7,17,1: 10,5,45:. So they rule over human beings as well kṣayantīś carṣaṇīnām cf. 1,5,4: 2,26,3: 36,3: (Agni and Soma) 6,138,2: 4: (Indra and others). They give their laws and orders dharman cf. 7,24,1: 25,2: 26,5: 18,1,5: 7:, they have power over the human mind and heart. So the Indians pray to the devas in their love-sadness that the devas might change the heart and mind of their beloved cf. 3,25,6: vy asyai Mitrā Varuṇau hṛdaś cittāny asyatam: "do ye Mitra Varuna cast out the intents from her heart", cf. also 6,130,4: cf. also 6,131,1: 132,1: 14,1,32:.

d) The devas have power over the firmament and the elements. Jyotir asta, sūryo, agnih … hiraṇyam, nākam adhi rohaya "be there light, sun, fire, gold make this man ascend" (1,9,2:) and 3,3,1: vyacasvatī rodasī urūcī "bend apart the wide firmament (and the earth)". The dhātar sustains the earth, the sky and the sun (6,60,3:), see

104,3: 19,20,1: 24,4:. We meet some *devas* praised as *svadhāvant* "self-ruling" cf. 4,1,7: 5,11,4: 5: 11: 18,1,26: sometimes as *vidhartā* "disposer" with others cf. 3,16,2: 13,4,3: etc.

They are "full of majesty" yaśasvin cf. 6,39,2: 3: 58,2: 3: and *daśra* 7,73,2: and *tanūvaśin* "self-controlling" cf. 4,4,4: 24,7:. They called themselves "handless" *nairhasta* to show their power (6,65,2: 3:) and elsewhere "gold-handed" cf. 3,21,8: 7,14,2: 115,2: or also "well-handed" *subāhus* cf. 7,46,2:.

Other descriptions of the *devas* reveal their kindheartedness and their pleasant nature. They amuse themselves easily cf. 6,73,2: 7,35,1: 118,1:, they are pleasant *syonaḥ* cf. 4,27,3: and cf. 6,62,2: or *juṣṭa* (5,7,4:) and also "honeyspeeched" (5,7,4:) *Indra's gladness is* great (6,33,1:).

All this proves the great respect the Indians had for their *devas*. We shall give now a last series of epithets and qualities belonging to them in which we even may consider a much higher esteem. It points into the direction of a true God.

21. The *devas* forgive sins: *devā muñcanto asṛjan nir enasaḥ* or *else in the edition of Shankar Pandurang (1895): devā muñcantaḥ asṛjan ni enas*, cf. 2,10,8: 6,113,1: 3: 114,1: 2: 115,1: 117,1: 3: cf. also 6,111,3: 4: etc. The following texts assign this epithet to Agni 3,15,4: 6,45,2: 62,1:. So one asked (in 19,40,1:) Bṛhaspati for amendment of sin; and also Varuṇa cf. 13,3,21:, and 19,44,8: is asked for the same. So the Maruts *7,77,3:. And 14,2,59—62 prays* "let Agni and Savitar release us from that sin". Even herbs are requested to forgive sins by power of the *devas* cf. 6,96,2:. Sometimes the *devas* are asked "to purify us" cf. 6,47,1: 51,1—3: 119,3:, also in the same texts Varuṇa is commanded to do the same, and Agni 6,62,1: and all the gods 6,19,1: 2:; so is Savitar 6,19,3:.

There is still another aspect to this: the *devas* "hate" the sinner, the selfish man, who is only concerned about himself cf. 3,31,1:; and so they punish the sinner 5,18,5: 8: 13: and "may we not fight with the mind of the gods" 7,52,2: [17]).

22. Another prerogative ascribed to the *devas* is their power over life and death, their dominion over human beings, over the sky and the elements and over the human mind and human heart.

a) *Power over life and death.*

They give life and therefore are called *ātmadā* cf. 4,2,1: or *āyurdā* cf. 2,13,1: 4: to Agni *2,17,4: for conception 5,25,1: to Dhātar 7,17,2:.*

They give children or the possibility of conception cf. 3,23,6: 6,11,3: 7,33,1: 46,1: 68,3: 89,2: 14,1,54: 2,1: 19,63,1:. The Indians

pray to the gods for a good delivery: *garbhaṃ samairayantām vy ūrṇuvantu sūtave* "send the foetus and let them unclose for delivery"; cf. 1,11,2: 3,23,6: 6,81,3:. They give a long life, very often called 100 "autumns" or the like. We find several aspects and nuances in this "giving of long life", so e.g. 2,28,2: 5: "let not friends slay him, nor his enemies"), or *vahātha jarase* "carry him to old age" cf. 1,30,2: 3: and 5,30,14:. We do not hear them often ask for a long life, but for the "length of life". And this span of lifetime is reckoned nowadays to be about 120 years, as Mahātmā Gandhi said about 6 weeks before his death.

They have power over sickness and death (2,12,4:) *harasā daivyena* cf. also 3,9,1:.

b) They have power over cattle cf. 2,26,1: 19,63,1: and Viṣṇu is called the "unhurtful shepherd" (7,26,5:). They even give "immortality" which means "the full span of life" 7,106,1: 118,1: cf. also 10,2,14:. They give to a man his wife cf. 3,25,6: 6,60,1: etc. (Aryaman) 82,2: 3: 2,30,2: (Aśvins) cf. also 6,130,1: etc. 131,1: etc. 14,1,50:; so they give a husband to a woman cf. 2,36,1: 3: and 14,2,1: and they are the creators of the body 10,2,4: 5: 8:.

c) The *devas* have authority and dominion over everything so e.g. *āpas* have mastery over every desirable thing cf. 1,5,4: *īśānā vāryāṇām*; the deeper meaning of 2,30,2: may be the same, where the Aśvins are said to be able to dispose of everything. 3,8,4: introduces the devas as the *gopā* "herdsmen and lords of prosperity". 3,8,1: says that the *devas* give "authority": *bṛhad rāṣṭram ... dadhātu* and [illegible] 7,17,1: 10,5,45:. So they rule over human beings as well *kṣayantīi carṣaṇīnām* cf. 1,5,4: 2,26,3. 36,3: (Agni and Soma) 6,138,2: 4: (Indra and others). They give their laws and orders *dharman* cf. 7,24,1: 25,2: 26,5: 18,1,5: 7:, they have power over the human mind and heart. So the Indians pray to the *devas* in their love-sadness that the *devas* might change the heart and mind of their beloved cf. 3,25,6: *vy asyai Mitrā Varuṇau hṛdaś cittāny asyatam*: "do ye Mitra Varuṇa cast out the intents from her heart", cf. also 6,130,4: cf. also 6,131,1: 132,1: 14,1,32:.

d) The *devas* have power over the firmament and the elements. *Jyotir astu, sūryo, agnih ... hiraṇyam, nākam adhi rohaya* "be there light, sun, fire, gold: make this man ascend" (1,9,2:) and 3,3,1: *vyacasvatī rodasī urvī* "bend apart the wide firmament (and the earth)". The *dhātar* sustains the earth, the sky and the sun (6,60,3:), see

also 6,69,3: although it might be open to another interpretation as well, "Let Prajāpati fix that in me, as the heaven in the sky"; cf. 6,100,1: 2:.

The *devas* maintain everything: *devā uttarasmiṃ jyotiṣi dhārayantu* (1,9,1:) cf. 19,58,2: about Bṛhaspati. They mantained security: *kṣemaṃ adīdharan* (3,3,5:) Pṛthivī maintains trees, mountains and also the expecting mother and her child cf. 6,17,1—4: and Agni and Soma are requested to maintain their supremacy 6,54,2:. The context of 1,13,4: implies that the *devas* have created the thunderstorm and lightnings. This passage uses *asṛjanta*, but 1,33,3: uses the word *kṛ-: kṛṇvanti* cf. also 13,3,1: 15:. So Prajāpati generates offspring *prajās* 7,19:. In his workshop Tvaṣṭar generates the woman (6,78,3:) and Agni the sun. He is also the principle from which the *devas* produce the entire creation cf. 13,1,25:. The same *devas* created also the sun 13,3,12: and again 19,17,9: praises Prajāpati for his enormous generative power *prajananavān* "having creative strength". It might be observed in passing that there is no clear evidence to allow the conclusion that, according to the Indians, the *devas* did create ex nihilo i.e. sine praejacente materia. After all *sṛj-* means still "to send out" and *kṛ-* means just the "making of a thing". According to 3,8,1: Mitra arranges the seasons *ṛtubhiḥ kalpamānaḥ* and the uniting of the earth with the "ruddy ones" (the sun? etc.). 3,31,7: by their breath the gods set in motion the sun: *prāṇena viśvatovīryaṃ devāḥ sūryaṃ samairayan* and 4,36,5: *ye devās tena hāsante sūryeṇa mimate javam* "the gods hasten with him, they measure the speed with the sun". So lightning and thunder are the signs of the devas 7,11:.

I believe these few quotations prove that the Indians were convinced *that some of their devas had a more than normal power or,* to be as sharp as possible, that their powers — maybe still natural — still do surpass the power of nature.

23. Another indication in that same direction of Supreme Being is the relationship between *devas* and *ṛta*. In the RV. section we gave a somewhat longer discussion of it. That may suffice here as well. We *meet the composita* and derivatives far less in AV. than in RV. We come across *prathamajam ṛtasya* "firstborn of righteousness" cf. 2,1,4: (Agni) 4,35,1: (Prajāpati) 5,17,1: (Mātariśvan) 6,122,1: (Viśvakarman) 8,9,21: (the *devas* as group) 18,2,15: (Yama's messengers).

We find *some derivatives as ṛtāvari* cf. 3,13,7: 6,36,1 where we find *ṛtasya pati* as well, further also *ṛtāvan* cf. e.g. 6,36,2: Cf. 18,2,15: We come across *ṛtāvṛdh "increasers of ṛta"* cf. 4,29,1: 11,6,19: 20: 18,2,15: and in 6,22,1: we hear "they have come from the seat of *ṛta*".

Another expression, used here of Varuṇa, is *satyānṛte avapaśyan* cf. 1,33,2: "he is looking (as a judge) at truth and falsehood". 6,1,2: praises Savitar as *satya sūnu* and 3,16,3: praises Bhāga as *satyarādhas* "of true bestowal".

7,6,2: occurs Aditi, mother of the Adityas i.e. Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhāga, called "spouse of ṛta": *ṛtasya patnī*. I might be mistaken, but in these quotations with *ṛta*, a somewhat more elevated feeling and a less materialistic tone could be felt. Something of the absoluteness of law and right eternal.

One point more is to be added: sometimes we do find a request for blessing from Agni *so asmabhyam adhi bravat* (1,16,1:), or from Indra 1,16,2: and Varuṇa. So also from the *devas* cf. 4,8,2:, and 18,3,10: the fathers are asked to anoint us with splendour and also the *devas* with ghee and honey.

24. After these characteristics of *devas* and *asuras*, objectivity demands that we throw some light on the ideas the Indians had in the AV. period about amulets and their so-called "powerful herbs".

a) The Amulets.

Some texts force the reader to believe that the Atharvavedic Indians had more faith in their amulets than in their *devas*. Indra is increased (in power) by a certain amulet *maṇinā yenendro abhivāvṛdhe* cf. 1,29,1: and it is even able to protest against *devas* and *asuras* (4,10,5:) and against Gandharvas and Apsarases (19,36,6:) also 8,7,2: stresses this protection against *devas* [24]).

Elsewhere it says that an amulet has been made by *devas* and men cf. 5,14,7: *devakṛtā* *va puruṣaiḥ kṛtā* (maṇi) and 10,6,32: tells us that the *devas* and *pitaras* and men always depend upon this amulet i.e. the destruction of the *Asuras* cf. 10,6,22:. The *devas* needed it in their battles (10,3,2:), also against the *asuras* (10,3,5: 11:) and in 19,33,3: and amulet of darbha is called: *devavarman* "defence of the gods" and 19,33,4: calls it "strength of the gods". A similar statement is found in 19,35,2:.

These amulets are given (2,4,4:) or approved by the *devas* 1,35,4: *devair dattena*. Their power is ojo *devānām* cf. 3,5,1: 3: 19,33,4: cf. also 5,14,3.. Also in 10,6,5: where we hear that the amulet comes from the *devas*. At times there is cooperation between *devas* and the amulets; several passages relate to us that the amulet has been *devajāta* "born from the gods" cf. 10,6,31: 19,32,7: 33,6: 34,6:.

Another point is that quite a number of adjectives, in other hymns, applied to the *devas*, occur here with the amulets, for instance "life-giving" 8,7,4: 1,35,1: 19,28,1: 32,1: 33,1: 37,2:. They are called

also 6,69,3: although it might be open to another interpretation as well, "Let Prajāpati fix that in me, as the heaven in the sky"; *cf.* 6,100,1: 2:.

The *devas* maintain everything: *devā uttarasmin jyotiṣi dhārayantu* (1,9,1:) cf. 19,58,2: about Bṛhaspati. They mantained security: *kṣemam adīdharan* (3,3,5:) Pṛthivī maintains trees, mountains and also the expecting mother and her child cf. 6,17,1—4: and Agni and Soma are requested to maintain their supremacy 6,54,2:. The context of 1,13,4: implies that the *devas* have created the thunderstorm and lightnings. This passage uses *asṛjanta*, but 1,33,3: uses the word *kṛ-*: *kṛṇvanti cf.* also 13,3,1: 15:. So Prajāpati generates offspring *prajāt* 7,19:. In his workshop Tvaṣṭar generates the woman (6,78,3:) and Agni the sun. He is also the principle from which the *devas* produce the entire creation cf. 13,1,25:. The same *devas* created also the sun 13,3,12: and again 19,17,9: praises Prajāpati for his enormous generative power *prajananavān* "having creative strength". It might be observed in passing that there is no clear evidence to allow the conclusion that, according to the Indians, the *devas* did create ex nihilo i.e. sine praejacente materia. After all *sṛj-* means still "to send out" and *kṛ-* means just the "making of a thing". According to 3,8,1: Mitra arranges the seasons *ṛtubhiḥ kalpamānaḥ* and the uniting of the earth with the "ruddy ones" (the sun? etc.). 3,31,7: by their breath the gods set in motion the sun: *prāṇena viśvatovīryaṃ devāḥ sūryaṃ samairayan* and 4,36,5: *ye devās tena hāsante sūryeṇa mimate javam* "the gods hasten with him, they measure the speed with the sun". So lightning and thunder are the signs of the devas 7,11:.

I believe these few quotations prove that the Indians were convinced that some of their *devas* had a more than normal power or, to be as sharp as possible, that their powers — maybe still natural — still do surpass the power of nature.

23. Another indication in that same direction of Supreme Being is the relationship between *devas* and *ṛta*. In the RV. section we gave a somewhat longer discussion of it That may suffice here as well. We meet the composita and derivatives far less in AV. than in RV. We come across *prathamajām ṛtasya* "firstborn of righteousness" cf. 2,1,4: (Agni) 4,35,1: (Prajāpati) 5,17,1: (Matariśvan) 6,122,1: (Viśvakarman) 8,9,21: (the *devas* as group) 18,2,15: (Yama's messengers).

We find some derivatives as *ṛtāvari* cf. 3,13,7: 6,36,1 where we find *ṛtasya pati* as well, further also *ṛtāvan* cf. e.g. 6,36,2:. Cf. 18,2,15: We come across *ṛtāvṛdh* "increasers of *ṛta*" cf. 4,29,1: 11,6,19: 23: 18,2,15: and in 6,22,1 we hear "they have come from the seat of *ṛta*".

Another expression, used here of Varuṇa, is *satyānṛte avapaśyam* cf. 1,33,2: "he is looking (as a judge) at truth and falsehood". 6,1,2: praises Savitar as *satya sānu* and 3,16,3: praises Bhāga as *satyarādhas* "of true bestowal".

7,6,2: occurs Aditi, mother of the Adityas i.e. Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhāga, called "spouse of *ṛta*": *ṛtasya patnī*. I might be mistaken, but in these quotations with *ṛta*, a somewhat more elevated feeling and a less materialistic tone could be felt. Something of the absoluteness of law and right eternal.

One point more is to be added: sometimes we do find a request for blessing from Agni *so asmabhyam adhi bravat* (1,16,1:), or from Indra 1,16,2: and Varuṇa. So also from the *devas* cf. 4,8,2:, and 18,3,10: the fathers are asked to anoint us with splendour and also the *devas* with ghee and honey.

24. After these characteristics of *devas* and *asuras*, objectivity demands that we throw some light on the ideas the Indians had in the AV. period about amulets and their so-called "powerful herbs".

a) The Amulets.

Some texts force the reader to believe that the Atharvavedic Indians had more faith in their amulets than in their *devas*. Indra is increased (in power) by a certain amulet *maṇinā yenendro abhivāvṛdhe* cf. 1,27,1: and it is even able to protest against *devas* and *asuras* (4,10,5:) and against Gandharvas and Apsarases (19,36,6:) also 8,7,2: stresses this protection against *devas* [14]).

Elsewhere it says that an amulet has been made by *deva* and men cf. 5,14,7: *devakṛtā* ... *tā puruṣaiḥ kṛtā* (maṇi) and 10,6,32: tells us that the *devas* and *pitaras* and men always depend upon this amulet i.e. the destruction of the *Asuras* cf. 10,6,22:. The *devas* needed it in their battles (10,3,2:), also against the *asuras* (10,3,5: 11:) and in 19,30,3: and amulet of darbha is called: *devavarman* "defence of the gods" and 19,33,4: calls it "strength of the gods". A similar statement is found in 19,35,2:.

These amulets are given (2,4,4:) or approved by the *devas* 1,35,4: *devair dattena*. Their power is ojo *devānām* cf. 3,5,1: 3: 19,33,4: cf. also 5,14,3:. Also in 10,6,5: where we hear that the amulet comes from the *devas*. At times there is cooperation between *devas* and the amulets; several passages relate to us that the amulet has been *devajāta* "born from the gods" cf. 10,6,31: 19,32,7: 33,6: 34,6:.

Another point is that quite a number of adjectives, in other hymns, applied to the *devas*, occur here with the amulets, for instance "life-giving" 8,7,4: 1,35,1: 19,28,1: 32,1: 33,1: 37,2:. They are called

also 6,69,3: although it might be open to another interpretation as well, "Let Prajāpati fix that in me, as the heaven in the sky"; cf. 6,100,1: 2:.

The *devas* maintain everything: *devā uttarasmiṃ jyotiṣi dhārayantu* (1,9,1:) cf. 19,58,2: about Bṛhaspati. They mantained security: *kṣemam adīdharan* (3,3,5:) Pṛthivī maintains trees, mountains and also the expecting mother and her child cf. 6,17,1—4: and Agni and Soma are requested to maintain their supremacy 6,54,2:. The context of 1,13,4: implies that the *devas* have created the thunderstorm and lightnings. This passage uses *asṛjanta*, but 1,33,3: uses the word *kṛ-*: *kṛṇvanti* cf. also 13,3,1: 15:. So Prajāpati generates offspring *prajās* 7,19:. In his workshop Tvaṣṭar generates the woman (6,78,3:) and Agni the sun. He is also the principle from which the *devas* produce the entire creation cf. 13,1,25:. The same *devas* created also the sun 13,3,12: and again 19,17,9: praises Prajāpati for his enormous generative power *prajananavān* "having creative strength". It might be observed in passing that there is no clear evidence to allow the conclusion that, according to the Indians, the *devas* did create ex nihilo i.e. sine praejacente materia. After all *sṛj-* means still "to send out" and *kṛ-* means just the "making of a thing". According to 3,8,1: Mitra arranges the seasons *ṛtubhiḥ kalpamānaḥ* and the uniting of the earth with the "ruddy ones" (the sun? etc.). 3,31,7: by their breath the gods set in motion the sun: *prāṇena viśvatovīryaṃ devāḥ sūryaṃ samairayan* and 4,36,5: *ye devās tena hāsante sūryeṇa mimate javam* "the gods hasten with him, they measure the speed with the sun". So lightning and thunder are the signs of the devas 7,11:.

I believe these few quotations prove that the Indians were convinced that some of their *devas* had a more than normal power or, to be as sharp as possible, that their powers — maybe still natural — still do surpass the power of nature.

23. Another indication in that same direction of Supreme Being is the relationship between *devas* and *ṛta*. In the RV. section we gave a somewhat longer discussion of it. That may suffice here as well. We meet the composita and derivatives far less in AV. than in RV. We come across *prathamajam ṛtasya* "firstborn of righteousness" cf. 2,1,4: (Agni) 4,35,1: (Prajāpati) 5,17,1: (Matariśvan) 6,122,1: (Viśvakarman) 8,9,21: (the *devas* as group) 18,2,15: (Yama's messengers).

We find some derivatives as *ṛtāvari* cf. 3,13,7: 6,36,1: where we find *ṛtasya pati* as well, further also *ṛtāvan* cf. e.g. 6,36,2:. Cf. 18,2,15: We come across *ṛtāvṛdh* "increasers of *ṛta*" cf. 4,29,1: 11,6,19: 20: 18,2,15: and in 6,22,1: we hear "they have come from the seat of *ṛta*".

Another expression, used here of Varuṇa, is *satyānṛte avapaśyam* cf. 1,33,2: "he is looking (as a judge) at truth and falsehood". 6,1,2: praises Savitar as *satya sāvā* and 3,16,3: praises Bhāga as *satyarādhas* "of true bestowal".

7,6,2: occurs Aditi, mother of the Adityas i.e. Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhāga, called "spouse of *ṛta*": *ṛtasya patnī*. I might be mistaken, but in these quotations with *ṛta*, a somewhat more elevated feeling and a less materialistic tone could be felt. Something of the absoluteness of law and right eternal.

One point more is to be added: sometimes we do find a request for blessing from Agni *so asmabhyam adhi bravat* (1,16,1:), or from Indra 1,16,2: and Varuṇa. So also from the *devas* cf. 4,8,2:, and 18,3,10: the fathers are asked to anoint us with splendour and also the *devas* with ghee and honey.

24. After these characteristics of *devas* and *asuras*, objectivity demands that we throw some light on the ideas the Indians had in the AV. period about amulets and their so-called "powerful herbs".

a) The Amulets.

Some texts force the reader to believe that the Atharvavedic Indians had more faith in their amulets than in their *devas*. Indra is increased (in power) by a certain amulet *maṇinā yenendro abhivāvṛdhe* cf. 1,29,1: and it is even able to protest against *devas* and *asuras* (4,10,5:) and against Gandharvas and Apsarases (19,36,6:) also 8,7,2: stresses this protection against *devas* [14]).

Elsewhere it says that an amulet has been made by *deva* and men cf. 5,14,7: *devakṛtā . . . vā puruṣaiḥ kṛtā* (maṇi) and 10,6,32: tells us that the *devas* and *pitaras* and men always depend upon this amulet i.e. the destruction of the *Asuras* cf. 10,6,22:. The *devas* needed it in their battles (10,3,2:), also against the *asuras* (10,3,5: 11:) and in 19,30,3: and amulet of darbha is called: *devavarman* "defence of the gods" and 19,33,4: calls it "strength of the gods". A similar statement is found in 19,35,2:.

These amulets are given (2,4,4:) or approved by the *devas* 1,35,4: *devair dattena*. Their power is *ojo devānām* cf. 3,5,1: 3: 19,33,4: cf. also 5,14,3:. Also in 10,6,5: where we hear that the amulet comes from the *devas*. At times there is cooperation between *devas* and the amulets; several passages relate to us that the amulet has been *devajāta* "born from the gods" cf. 10,6,31: 19,32,7: 33,6: 34,6:.

Another point is that quite a number of adjectives, in other hymns, applied to the *devas*, occur here with the amulets, for instance "life-giving" 8,7,4: 1,35,1: 19,28,1: 32,1: 33,1: 37,2:. They are called

also 6,69,3: although it might be open to another interpretation as well, "Let Prajāpati fix that in me, as the heaven in the sky"; cf. 6,100,1: 2:.

The *devas* maintain everything: *devā uttarasmiṃ jyotiṣi dhārayantu* (1,9,1:) cf. 19,58,2: about Bṛhaspati. They mantained security: *kṣemam adīdharan* (3,3,5:) Pṛthivī maintains trees, mountains and also the expecting mother and her child cf. 6,17,1—4: and Agni and Soma are requested to maintain their supremacy 6,54,2:. The context of 1,13,4: implies that the *devas* have created the thunderstorm and lightnings. This passage uses *asṛjanta*, but 1,33,3: uses the word *kṛ-*: *kṛṇvanti* cf. also 13,3,1: 15:. So Prajāpati generates offspring *prajās* 7,19:. In his workshop Tvaṣṭar generates the woman (6,78,3:) and Agni the sun. He is also the principle from which the *devas* produce the entire creation cf. 13,1,25:. The same *devas* created also the sun 13,3,12: and again 19,17,9: praises Prajāpati for his enormous generative power *prajananavān* "having creative strength". It might *be observed in passing that there is no clear evidence to allow the* conclusion that, according to the Indians, the *devas* did create ex nihilo i.e. *sine praejacente materia.* After all *sṛj-* means still "to send out" and *kṛ-* means just the "making of a thing". According to 3,8,1: Mitra arranges the seasons *ṛtubhiḥ kalpamānaḥ* and the uniting of the earth with the "ruddy ones" (the sun? etc.). 3,31,7: by their breath the gods set in motion the sun: *prāṇena viśvatovīryaṃ devāḥ sūryaṃ samaīrayan* and 4,36,5: *ye devās tena hāsante sūryeṇa mimate javam* "the gods hasten with him, they measure the speed with the sun". So lightning and thunder are the signs of the devas 7,11:.

I believe these few quotations prove that the Indians were convinced *that some of their devas had a more than normal power or,* to be as sharp as possible, that their powers — maybe still natural — still do surpass the power of nature.

23. Another indication in that same direction of Supreme Being is the relationship between *devas* and *ṛta* In the RV. section we gave a somewhat longer discussion of it That may suffice here as well. We meet the composita and derivatives far less in AV. than in RV. We come across *prathamajam ṛtasya* "firstborn of righteousness" *cf. 2,1,4: (Agni) 4,35,1: (Prajāpati) 5,17,1: (Mātariśvan) 6,122,1:* (Viśvakarman) 8,9,21: (the *devas* as group) 18,2,15: (Yama's messengers).

We find some derivatives as *ṛtāvari* cf. 3,13,7. 6,36,1 where we find *ṛtasya patis* as well, further also *ṛtāvan* cf. e.g. 6,36,2: Cf 18,2,15: We come across *ṛtāvṛdh* "increasers of *ṛta*" cf. 4,29,1: 11,6,19: 20: 18,2,15: and in 6,22,1: we hear "they have come from the seat of *ṛta*".

Another expression, used here of Varuṇa, is *satyānṛte avapaśyaṃ* cf. 1,33,2: "he is looking (as a judge) at truth and falsehood". 6,1,2: praises Savitar as *satya sūnu* and 3,16,3: praises Bhāga as *satyarādhas* "of true bestowal".

7,6,2: occurs Aditi, mother of the Adityas i.e. Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhāga, called "spouse of *ṛta*": *ṛtasya patnī*. I might be mistaken, but in these quotations with *ṛta*, a somewhat more elevated feeling and a less materialistic tone could be felt. Something of the absoluteness of law and right eternal.

One point more is to be added: sometimes we do find a request for blessing from Agni *so asmabhyam adhi bravat* (1,16,1:), or from Indra 1,16,2: and Varuṇa. So also from the *devas* cf. 4,8,2:, and 18,3,10: the fathers are asked to anoint us with splendour and also the *devas* with ghee and honey.

24. After these characteristics of *devas* and *asuras*, objectivity demands that we throw some light on the ideas the Indians had in the AV. period about amulets and their so-called "powerful herbs".

a) The Amulets.

Some texts force the reader to believe that the Atharvavedic Indians had more faith in their amulets than in their *devas*. Indra is increased (in power) by a certain amulet *maṇinā yenendro abhivāvṛdhe* cf. 1,29,1: and it is even able to protest against *devas* and *asuras* (4,10,5:) and against Gandharvas and Apsarases (19,36,6:) also 8,7,2: stresses this protection against *devas* [14]).

Elsewhere it says that an amulet has been made by *deva* and men cf. 5,14,7: *devakṛtā . . . vā puruṣaiḥ kṛtā* (maṇi) and 10,6,32: tells us that the *devas* and *pitaras* and men always depend upon this amulet i.e. the destruction of the *Asuras* cf. 10,6,22:. The *devas* needed it in their battles (10,3,2:), also against the *asuras* (10,3,5: 11:) and in 19,30,3: and amulet of darbha is called: *devavarman* "defence of the gods" and 19,33,4: calls it "strength of the gods". A similar statement is found in 19,35,2:.

These amulets are given (2,4,4:) or approved by the *devas* 1,35,4: *devair dattena*. Their power is *ojo devānām* cf. 3,5,1: 3: 19,33,4: cf. also 5,14,3:. Also in 10,6,5: where we hear that the amulet comes from the *devas*. At times there is cooperation between *devas* and the amulets; several passages relate to us that the amulet has been *devajāta* "born from the gods" cf. 10,6,31: 19,32,7: 33,6: 34,6:.

Another point is that quite a number of adjectives, in other hymns, applied to the *devas*, occur here with the amulets, for instance "life-giving" 8,7,4: 1,35,1: 19,28,1: 32,1: 33,1: 37,2:. They are called

"heroes" cf. 8,5,1: etc., "rival-slaying" 8,5,2: 10,3,1: 6,29: 19,30,4: 31,8: 32,10: 33,2:, as well as "powerful and vigorous" cf. 8,5,1: "overpowering" 10,6,29: "formidable" the adjective *ugra* specially of Indra cf. 8,5,1: 19,33,4: and 8,5,5: calls the devas the *purohitas* "representatives", implicitly strengthened by this amulet. Again some passages show us — as we might have expected — the amulet as a *deva* itself cf. 8,5,20: *devamaṇi* and 19,33,1: *devo maṇiḥ*.

25. *A last paragraph about the herbs.*

First of all it must be stated that not every application of a herb is necessarily a sort of magic. Vroklage states in his Godsdienst der primitieven [15]): "*Gift blijft als drank of poeder zijn gewone kenmerken bezitten, die het van nature en dus altijd bezit, maar daarnaast wordt er een bizondere kracht door bepaalde middelen, mengsels of spreuken van een deskundige aan toegevoegd, waardoor het volgens de primitieve opvatting tot gift — tot deze bepaalde magische kracht wordt.*" And in his lectures he always stressed the point that the primitive has a good discrimination for the natural powers of a herb or medicine, and for the magic influence, and he also emphasized this particular point: "these two he will mix up, and never get mixed up by it." So a number of passages and entire hymns sing of the power of the herbs, some of which I would regard as pure medicines (but may be magically administered) like e.g. 1,23,1: 2,3: and 4,12: and elsewhere the wording of the hymns lays stress on more than natural power e.g. 1,22: and 1,24: cf. also 1,34: (as a lovespell) or 1,35: where they use gold as a means of prolonging life.

Those herbs are called *devajātā* cf. 2,7,1: 6,136,1: 19,32,7: (of the darbha). Elsewhere they are mentioned as *devair dattam* cf. 4,9,1:, so 2,25,1: calls a herb *devī pṛśniparṇī* "divine spotted leaf" and also other passages give this title of *devī* to the plants and herbs cf. 4,20,1: 2:, also 19,33,1:. Some herbs are antidotal cf. 4,6 and 4,7:. Else 4,17: we find some against witchcraft and devils, but nowhere against the *devas*. 6,136 and 137 are made for increase of hair. And this hair-restorer is called *deva* (6,136,1:) and in 8,7,20 *amṛtam* even more: herbs might serve against sin and help us to have our sins forgiven; cf. 6,96,2: 8,7,10: 10,1,12:.

Conclusions.

Recapitulating, we see *deva* as a name for in fact non-human beings. Anyhow, it means something sublime. But we may not consider this title *deva* too high because beasts and seeds and even a hair-restorer are given this name as well. The *devas* give prosperity as they are lords of riches and wealth, they are "immortal", but they share this "great vitality" with the waters, plants, and herbs. This quality

has been acquired and surely is not inborn from origin. The *devas* are wise but their wisdom is not omniscience. They are honoured by offerings and sacrifices; they, however, need sacrifices as means to reach their ends and so they sacrifice for themselves. They are always ready to help and therefore easily invoked as they have a kind and friendly attitude when they are praised and sacrificed to. They are mighty and formidable, and so able to help and to extend protection. However mighty, they are never mentioned as being almighty in the strict sense and their paramountcy is bound to certain spheres of influence. Their power is still growing and increasing. It seems that there is no difference between *asuras*, *devas* and human beings in essentials, but their is some discrimination between *asuras* and *devas*. Among *devas* are ties of blood and sex-relationship.

But, there are certainly some divine characteristics among the traits of character of the *devas*. And here I use "divine" in sensu stricto: they forgive and punish sins. They have power over life and death, the elements and even over the human minds and hearts. They give *authority*, and *maintain* and *support everything; sometimes they are* connected with *ṛta*.

Even these traits, however sublime they might appear, are blemished by the fact that the same qualities and characteristics are given to and praised in herbs and amulets, and that these seem to be on the very same level and sometimes even higher than the devas.

I add some observations:

1) My own opinion is, that the terms *deva*, *daivī*, *divya* are too readily used. It looks as if they had a very high meaning in olden times. But *deva* and its derivatives might have lost much of their initial meaning. It may have implied: "absolutely divine". Some traits of character still call to mind the old contents, but being now so often used, it lost the old meaning of deus in sensu stricto, and has become: *sublime, exalted, superhuman*, just as we also use "divine" for quite a number of things and persons "quite undivine".

2) The old sense of *deva* seems to have gone to powers of protection and help, powers of nature, remorse, (fear of punishment for our sins) powers of fertility, fecundity and wisdom, powers of prosperity and might, thoughts to be persons; though of no divine nature, then surely of superhuman nature with quite a few human traits and some strictly divine characteristics.

Vedic man was so caught up by the dangers and magic of his environment that he looked for help and protection against such fears and anxiousness. But his mind must have been influenced by the cultures he met, so that his ideas about *deva* fairly early, already in RV. are lowering more and more, and in the end the dog and a hair-

restorer, every healing herb and love-spell ends up in being praised and lauded as "*deva*".

So *deva* will have this meaning for us: "a superhuman power, sometimes kind and of helpful strength, but nowhere in essence divine, though here or there some traits might allude to that, but nowhere universally — having a good number of strictly human characteristics, and used even for inanimate nature".

Opinions of the authorities.

Working through the publications on Rg Veda, Atharva Veda, on their age, as well as their cultural background, it struck me that only a small number of passages were dedicated to the precise rendering of the term *deva*, though many, many books were written on the Religions of India as a whole. Yet, this has been the very reason for this paper. However, one is able to discover, "between the lines", all kinds of opinions on this topic, but nobody undertook serious research. We noted the following nuances among the theories of the authors.

1. The *devas* are aspects of the only Divine Being. "Zwischen diesen Göttergestalten besteht eben tatsächlich keine scharfe Grenze. Sie sind im Grunde eins und dasselbe, Beinamen des höchsten guten Wesens" [36]). The same author, L. von Schröder, tries to explain on p. 441—445 that: "*the name of God was Dyaus, Dyaus pitar, Asura or Dyaus Asura. But the other aspects of God were expressed by Varuna (Umfasser, Allumfasser), Mitra (friend), Aryaman (truthful especially in contracts), Parjanya (nourishing one) and Daksa-Dhātar as the creating and ordening aspect*". In my opinion Schröder does here a bit of wishful thinking: he transplants his own ideas regarding the Divine Being into the thoughts of the Vedic priests.

Macdonell [37]) speaking on those aspects of the *devas* regarding fire, lightning and the sun, states: "*aspects which the Vedic poets are fond of alluding to in riddles, would suggest the idea that various deities are but different forms of a single divine being. This idea is found in more than one passage: cf. RV. 1,164: 10,114,5:.*"

So also G. Dumézil [38]): "*Mais les poètes du Rg Veda quels que fussent parfois les élans de leur pitié, n'ont jamais pensé, n'ont jamais souhaité que Varuṇa fût seul à les administrer. Ils sont restés fidèles à une conception plus analytique, heritée, nous l'avons vu, des temps indo-européens.*"

2. Other writers consider the *devas* as "natural gods" (natuurgodheid). *This very term may say anything and nothing.* What do the authors mean by this expression? Some of them do not give an

explanation. L. von Schröder o.c. p. 329 relates: "und er (Zarathustra) warf zugleich die Mehrzahl der alten Naturgötter, der *devas*, die Konkurrenten des Ahura in Bezug auf göttliche Macht, aus seinem Olymp hinaus und stempelte sie zu bösen Dämonen, darunter auch Indra." According to the ideas of von Schröder Zarathustra probably eliminated the *devas* as "nature deities" or he might find himself in a contradictory situation.

The same idea is fostered by Majumdar [19]) "The chief deities of the earlier books owe their origin to personification of natural phenomena." So also Jacobi [20]): "Die vedischen Götter sind teils Naturgötter bei denen die in ihnen repräsentierte Naturkraft zu Tage liegt, zum B. Sūrya, Uṣas, Vāyu and Vāta, teils solche Naturgötter bei denen die ethische Bedeutung mehr in den Vordergrund tritt, wie Agni, Indra (priesterlicher Gott und himmlischer König)". Thus Farquhar in his "Outline of Religious Literature". "They (the gods) are personifications of nature, they lack character and tend to melt into one another" (p. 15). And M. Bloomfield: "They are the gods who are at one and the same time nature, object; and person" [21]) and again (o.c., p. 182) he ascertains that *devas* are most often in some relation to the visible and audible powers of nature. Cambridge History of India I, p. 103: "The objects of devotion of the priests were the great phenomena of nature conceived as alive and usually represented in anthropomorphic shape". So Barnett [22]): "all these (gods) are or were originally deified powers of nature". About the same opinion has B. K. Ghosh in his Vedic Age cf. p. 219 and 360, and E. W. Hopkins in his Ethics of India, p. 4.

3. A. B. Keith [23]) explains that: "seeing mountains, plants and trees, sacrificial grass and sacrificial posts, arms, as *devas*, indicates fetishism. Doubtless in this we are to see fetishism rather than full divinity: the thing adored attains for the time being and in its special use a holiness which is not perpetually and normally its own."

4. H. Oldenberg [24]) likes to see it from another angle. Though he does not use the term itself, he strongly suggests that the worship of the *devas* is animism. "Für den vedischen Glauben ist die ganze den Menschen umgebende Welt beseelt. Alles ist erfüllt vom lebendigen dem Menschen bald freundlichen bald feindlichen Geister-Dasein".

5. But as regards the evil-minded *devas* Oldenberg holds the opinion that: "die Mehrzahl der bösen Geister sind verstorbene Menschen" (o.c., p. 58) and "ganz fehlen direkte Spuren des Zusammenhangs verschiedenartiger Dämonen mit Seelen Verstorbener übrigens auch in der älteren Literatur nicht" (o.c., p. 58).

6. Some other writers considered the *devas* as superhuman beings, whose force surpasses man's, have something divine, yet more per appropriationem than from their own inner selb [23]). "Dasz das Wort übernatürliche Wesen überhaupt, also auch böse Wesen, dämonisches Wesen bezeichne" and more clearly Arbman expresses himself at the end of his work: "In der Volkreligion entscheiden — und dies gilt besonders von der indischen Religion — nicht ethische Gesichtspunkte ob ein Wesen ein Gott ist oder nicht. Eher hat man in *deva* ein Wesen von etwas grösseren Dimensionen und selbständigerer Individualität zu sehen" (o.c., p. 153). H. von Glasenapp [24]) comes to the same conclusions. "Die Heiligen, die Engel, der Teufel und seine Heerscharen nehmen dem einen Gott gegenüber eine ähnliche Stellung ein wie die vielen Gottheiten des Hindu-Pantheons gegenüber dem Weltenherrn. Wenn die letzteren als "Götter" (deva, devatā) bezeichnet werden, die ersteren nicht, so ist dies mehr ein formaler als ein wesenhafter Unterschied, der in der verschieden gearteten historischen Entwicklung der einzelnen Religionen seinen Grund hat."

7. And lastly I come to S. Radhakrishnan [25]). He gives an entirely new explanation, to which however I cannot adhere. "An important point to be borne in mind in this discussion is that the word *deva* is so very elusive in its nature and is used to indicate many different things. "Deva is one who gives to man". God is deva because He gives the whole world. The learned man who imparts knowledge to fellow-man is also a deva. The sun, the moon, and "the sky" are devas because they give light to all creation. Father and mother and spiritual guides are also devas. Even a guest is a deva. We have to take into account only that notion of deva which answers at least roughly to the modern conception of God. It means *bright*". I would remark that the very application of the term *deva* to all those beings proves that its contents are widely different from our idea of "God".

EXAMINATION OF THE BRAHMANAS

For further investigation into the concept of *deva* in the Vedic period we have examined the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa (in Auswahl Caland) and the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa (ed. H. Oertel).

We have found a number of passages where *deva* does not have any evident contents. *Deva* has been used for a groupname cf. P. Br. 1,1,7: *mṛdā śithirā devānāṃ tīrthaṃ vedir asi mā mā hiṃsīḥ.* "Through clay soft (art thou) the ford of the Gods, the vedi art thou; do not hurt me"[1]).

J. Up. Br. 3,26,5: suggests at least something that is not without evident contents, but with regard to a more exalted being. (*Tṛptir*) *taṃ devān abhipravahati:* ("satisfaction"). It carries him forth to the gods". But I hesitate to state that it is of value. In my opinion it is no more than a slight suggestion.

Elsewhere we find *deva* as a mere title in a number of passages: something like: "divine". Sometimes the context indicates a nuance of sublime and exalted. cf. P. Br. 1,5,1: "the doors of divine order ye are" cf. also P. Br. 1,6,4: and 1,6,5: 9: 11: 12: and about Savitṛ 1,8,1: and the next stanza 2: we hear about a "divine" *Dakṣiṇā*. So Vāyu is called a *deva* P. Br. 4,6,7: and Aditya P. Br. 15,4,2: and even the pressing stones and the waters P. Br. 21,10,17: 20: the Maruts P. Br. 21,14,3: and Varuṇa P. Br. 24,18,8:.

Jaim. Br. § 186 states that the *devas* need the somadraught and that they are feeble and weak if they abstain from this drink: *yuvaṃ vā asarvan stho, yan devan santāv asomapau sthaḥ*, which Caland renders: "Ihr seid gebrechlich, weil ihr, obgleich Götter, nicht den Somatrank bekommt". In J. Up. Br. we discover that the *sāman* belongs to the *devas* cf. 1,33,5: 8: 36,10: 42,1:. So about the *diśaḥ* 2,2,4: and 11,5: *imā diśo 'bhavan tā u eva viśve devāḥ.* 3,4,8: renders this title to Vāyu and the *antarikṣa* and 3,28,1: 2: renders the same title to the sun and the moon.

2. The *devas* are in some aspects like human beings.

a) They themselves sacrifice. cf. P. Br. 1,1,2: 11,5,6: 23,6,3: 5: and J. Br. § 23 and § 207. It is interesting to discover that the *devas* very

often sacrifice, present offerings, and sing hymns; that they press the soma, but we never hear mentioned to whom they offer and sing their sacred hymns. This indicates that already in these late Vedic times the Indians considered every sacrificial rite or song as a power in itself. They saw them as a performance of acts automatically influencing everything by their inherent power and they obviously believed that the very rites did not demand and presume a higher *deva* or supreme being for further intervention.

Another aspect of th [illegible] is the frequent ascribing of priesthood to certain *devas.* [illegible] priestly functions. cf. P. Br. 1,3,5: 9,4,5: 21,10,1 [illegible] Br. 3,6,7: "he is born for the office of *purohita*". But side by side [illegible] him we encounter Bṛhaspati as the *udgātṛ*, of the gods, cf. P. Br. 6,5,5: 6,7,1: and P. Br. 25,1,7: states that he is *purohita.* J. Br. § 140 gives Agni the same title and function! An interesting quotation from P. Br. 13,5,5: tells us the well known fact that Viṣṇu himself is the sacrifice. Prof. J. Gonda in his work: Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954, p. 77 ff., dedicates a chapter to this fact. J. Br. § 27 states that yajña is the *devaratha* "the vehiculum of the gods" and § 108 that Prajāpati created or emanated sacrifice: *Prajāpatir yajñam asṛjata.*

J. Br. § 93 and § 98 render the following fact: "by intercourse one is born into this world, by sacrifice one is born to the other world", *tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate: 'tha yad yajñāj jāyate, tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate gandharvalokāya jāyate, devalokāya jāyate svargalokāya jāyate.* So at times it struck me that *yajñam* has a wider range of influence than the *deva.*

P. Br. 12,8,6: refers to a certain Dadhyañc as *purohita devānām.* Elsewhere we hear that the *devas* like to be present at *sattras* and other sacrificial sessions. cf. P. Br. 6,2,6: *sa devena yajñena yajate ya evam veda:* "sacrifice where the *devas* are present, is performed by him who knows this etc."

b) The *devas* have bodies.

J. Up. Br. 1,15,5:*devā vai svargam lokam āyan, ta etāny ṛkpadāni śarīrāṇi dhūnvanta āyan*: "They kept shaking off their bodies — that are the *rc*-parts, and so they went to the heavenly world"; cf. also 3,30,4:.

Because the *devas* possess bodies they can be hurt cf. P. Br. 16,10,10: and so they need medicines, which the Atharvans have *bheṣajam vai devānām atharvāṇo bheṣajyāyaivāriṣṭyai* So the *devas* can be taken ill, cf. P. Br. 21,4,2: and also be subject to old age 25,17,3:.

c) The *devas* can be afraid.

They can be afraid that the sun might fall cf. P. Br. 4,5,9:, they

are afraid of Agni (P. Br. 5,3,9:). Elsewhere we meet the expression that the *devas* are afraid of confusion, P. Br. 13,4,8:. So Indra is afraid of Vṛtra P. Br. 12,5,21: and in 15,11,9: he is related as fleeing from Vṛtra. Also J. Br. shows us the *devas* in great terror. The *devas* are afraid of the burning heat of the sun (J. Br. § 11) and of the Vajra (§ 26) though it is their own weapon. Indra is frightened to death of Vṛtra, particularly as he doubts, whether he killed the Vṛtra by the Vajra cf. J. Br. § 33: 142: 158:. The *devas* are even afraid that the human beings will overtake them (J. Br. § 168) and § 131 relates about the fright of the *devas* of their opponents, the *Asuras*.

d) This implies that the *devas* need strengthening of their natural forces. So we hear in P. Br. 4,1,15: that Prajāpati strengthened himself by the *pṛṣṭhasāman: sa idaṃ bhuvanaṃ prajanayitvā pṛṣṭhyena ṣaḍahena vīryam ātmany adhatta.* cf. J. Br. § 139 and § 166; also P. Br. 4,10,1: 9,6,7: 10,2,1: 15,8,2: those last citations are remarkable where we read: "Prajāpati had created the creatures: he was exhausted". So P. Br. 18,5,2: and 18,11,1: 4: show us Indra totally ... brought back and revived with the help of the other den Gott... *... annādyam udakrāmat*: "Von ... ung".

The quotations made abo... to us quite clearly that the late-Vedic Indian had no idea of *devas* of inexhaustible powers. Time and again they state that Prajāpati after his creation was fully "emptied and milked out" as the translation runs. And Indra's strength went amiss by his slaying Vṛtra. So we may conclude that the Indians regarded the powers of the *devas* as limited.

e) As a matter of fact we have to note that the *devas* are nowhere considered as omnipotent. We found numerous proofs for this. cf. P. Br. 8,8,1: *ukthāni nāśaknuvan*: "He could not conquer the ukthas". We come across this "non possumus" practically everywhere cf. P. Br. 9,1,1: "they could not discern the *asuras* and so they needed the *pragātha* to drive the *asuras* away". cf. also P. Br. 9,5,4: where is spoken of the *devas* in need of the *pūtika* (plant) and P. Br. 5,3,9: where they are said to use the Varaṇa in order to prevent ill-luck. So P. Br. 10,7,2: *devā vai śriyam aicchan*: "the *devas* sought fortune or they desired it". They always look for something else to help materialize their wishes and never use their own powers, but they make use of hymns and rites as the means to furnish them the forces to succeed. cf. P. Br. 14,9,34: 15,3,39: 19,7,1: 20,3,2: 4:. Even Vindanvat the son of Bhṛgu struck at Indra: *Vindanvān vai Bhārgava Indrasya pratyahan* (P. Br. 13,11,10). So it appears that even Indra is liable to strokes. J. Br. § 48 where Indra asked for a third pressing of the soma and the *devas* answered: "we cannot,

often sacrifice, present offerings, and sing hymns; that they press the soma, but we never hear mentioned to whom they offer and sing their sacred hymns. This indicates that already in these late Vedic times the Indians considered *every sacrificial rite or song as a power in itself. They saw them as a performance of acts automatically influencing everything by their inherent power and they obviously believed that the very rites did not demand and presume a higher deva or supreme being for further intervention.*

Another aspect of the same idea is the frequent ascribing of priesthood to certain *devas*. We find Agni as performing priestly functions. cf. P. Br. 1,3,5: 9,4,5: 21,10,11: 24,13,5: and J. Up. Br. 3,6,7: "he is born for the office of *purohita*". But side by side with him we encounter Bṛhaspati as the *udgātṛ*, of the gods, cf. P. Br. 6,5,5: 6,7,1: and P. Br. 25,1,7: states that he is *purohita*. J. Br. § 140 gives Agni the same title and function! An interesting quotation from P. Br. 13,5,5: tells us the well known fact that Viṣṇu himself is the sacrifice. Prof. J. Gonda in his work: Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954, p. 77 ff., dedicates a chapter to this fact. J. Br. § 27 states that yajña is the *devaratha* "the vehiculum of the gods" and § 108 that Prajāpati created or emanated sacrifice: *Prajāpatir yajñam asṛjata.*

J. Br. § 93 and § 98 render the following fact: "by intercourse one is born into this world, by sacrifice one is born to the other world", *tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate: 'tha yad yajñāj jāyate, tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate gandharvalokāya jāyate, devalokāya jāyate svargalokāya jāyate.* So at times it struck me that *yajñam* has a wider range of influence than the *deva*.

P. Br. 12,8,6: refers to a certain Dadhyañc as *purohita devānām.* Elsewhere we hear that the *devas* like to be present at *sattras* and other sacrificial sessions. cf. P. Br. 6,2,6: *sa devena yajñena yajate ya evaṃ veda:* "sacrifice where the *devas* are present, is performed by him who knows this etc."

b) The *devas* have bodies.

J. Up. Br. 1,15,5:devā vai svargaṃ lokam āyan, ta etāny ṛkpadāni śarīrāṇi dhūnvanta āyan. "They kept shaking off their bodies — that are the ṛc-parts, and so they went to the heavenly world"; cf. also 3,30,4:.

Because the *devas* possess bodies they can be hurt cf. P. Br. 16,10,10: and so they need medicines, which the Atharvans have *bheṣajaṃ vai devānām atharvāṇo bheṣajyāyaivāriṣṭhyai.* So the *devas* can be taken ill, cf. P. Br. 21,4,2: and also be subject to old age 25,17,3:.

c) The *devas* can be afraid.

They can be afraid that the sun might fall cf. P. Br. 4,5,9:, they

are afraid of Agni (P. Br. 5,3,9:). Elsewhere we meet the expression that the *devas* are afraid of confusion, P. Br. 13,4,8:. So Indra is afraid of Vṛtra P. Br. 12,5,21: and in 15,11,9: he is related as fleeing from Vṛtra. Also J. Br. shows us the *devas* in great terror. The *devas* are afraid of the burning heat of the sun (J. Br. § 11) and of the Vajra (§ 26) though it is their own weapon. Indra is frightened to death of Vṛtra, particularly as he doubts, whether he killed the Vṛtra by the Vajra cf. J. Br. § 33: 142: 158:. The *devas* are even afraid that the human beings will overtake them (J. Br. § 168) and § 131 relates about the fright of the *devas* of their opponents, the *Asuras*.

d) This implies that the *devas* need strengthening of their natural forces. So we hear in P. Br. 4,1,15: that Prajāpati strengthened himself by the *pṛṣṭhasāman: sa idaṃ bhuvanaṃ prajanayitvā pṛṣṭhyena ṣaḍahena vīryam ātmany adhatta.* cf. J. Br. § 139 and § 166; also P. Br. 4,10,1: 9,6,7: 10,2,1: 15,8,2: those last citations are remarkable where we read: "Prajāpati had created the creatures: he was exhausted". So P. Br. 18,5,2: and 18,11,1: 4: show us Indra totally [illegible] brought back and revived with the help of the other [illegible] *annādyam udakrāmat*: "Von [illegible]".

The quotations [illegible] is quite clearly that the late-Vedic Indian had no idea of *devas* [illegible]xhaustible powers. Time and again they state that Prajāpati after his creation was fully "emptied and milked out" as the translation runs. And Indra's strength went amiss by his slaying Vṛtra. So we may conclude that the Indians regarded the powers of the *devas* as limited.

e) As a matter of fact we have to note that the *devas* are nowhere considered as omnipotent. We found numerous proofs for this. cf. P. Br. 8,8,1: *ukthāni nāśaknuvan*: "He could not conquer the ukthas". We come across this "non possumus" practically everywhere cf. P. Br. 9,1,1: "they could not discern the *asuras* and so they needed the *pragātha* to drive the *asuras* away". cf. also P. Br. 9,5,4: where is spoken of the *devas* in need of the *pūtika* (plant) and P. Br. 5,3,9: where they are said to use the Varaṇa in order to prevent ill-luck. So P. Br. 10,7,2: *devā vai śriyam aicchan*: "the *devas* sought fortune or they desired it". They always look for something else to help materialize their wishes and never use their own powers, but they make use of hymns and rites as the means to furnish them the forces to succeed. cf. P. Br. 14,9,34: 15,3,39: 19,7,1: 20,3,2: 4:. Even Vindanvat the son of Bhṛgu struck at Indra: *Vindanvān vai Bhārgava Indrasya pratyahan* (P. Br. 13,11,10). So it appears that even Indra is liable to strokes. J. Br. § 48 where Indra asked for a third pressing of the soma and the *devas* answered: "we cannot,

often *sacrifice, present offerings*, and sing hymns; that they press the soma, but we never hear mentioned to whom they offer and sing their sacred hymns. This indicates that already in these late Vedic times the Indians considered every sacrificial rite or song as a power in itself. They saw them as a performance of acts automatically influencing everything by their inherent power and they obviously believed that the very rites did not demand and presume a higher *deva* or supreme being for further intervention.

Another aspect of the same idea is the frequent ascribing of priesthood to certain *devas*. We find Agni as performing priestly functions. cf. P. Br. 1,3,5: 9,4,5: 21,10,11: 24,13,5: and J. Up. Br. 3,6,7: "he is born for the office of *purohita*". But side by side with him we encounter Bṛhaspati as the *udgātṛ*, of the gods, cf. P. Br. 6,5,5: 6,7,1: and P. Br. 25,1,7: states that he is *purohita*. J. Br. § 140 gives Agni the same title and function! An interesting quotation from P. Br. 13,5,5: tells us the well known fact that Viṣṇu himself is the sacrifice. Prof. J. Gonda in his work: Aspects of early Viṣṇuism, Utrecht 1954, p. 77 ff., dedicates a chapter to this fact. J. Br. § 27 states that yajña is the *devaratha* "the vehiculum of the gods" and § 108 that Prajāpati created or emanated sacrifice: *Prajāpatir yajñam asṛjata*.

J. Br. § 93 and § 98 render the following fact: "by intercourse one is born into this world, by sacrifice one is born to the other world", *tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate: 'tha yad yajñāj jāyate, tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate gandharvalokāya jāyate, devalokāya jāyate svargalokāya jāyate*. So at times it struck me that *yajñam* has a wider range of influence than the *deva*.

P. Br. 12,8,6: refers to a certain Dadhyañc as *purohita devānām*. Elsewhere we hear that the *devas* like to be present at *sattras* and other sacrificial sessions. cf. P. Br. 6,2,6: *sa devena yajñena yajate ya evaṃ veda*: "sacrifice where the *devas* are present, is performed by him who knows this etc."

b) The *devas* have bodies.

J. Up. Br. 1,15,5:*devā vai svargaṃ lokam āyan, ta etāny ṛkpadāni śarīrāṇi dhūnvanta āyan*: "They kept shaking off their bodies — that are the ṛc-parts, and so they went to the heavenly world"; cf. also 3,30,4:.

Because the *devas* possess bodies they can be hurt cf. P. Br. 16,10,10: and so they need medicines, which the Atharvans have *bheṣajaṃ vai devānām atharvāṇo bheṣajyāyaivāriṣṭhyai*. So the *devas* can be taken ill, cf. P. Br. 21,4,2: and also be subject to old age 25,17,3:.

c) The *devas* can be afraid.

They can be afraid that the sun might fall cf. P. Br. 4,5,9:, they

Prajāpati desires and craves for light P. Br. 16,1,1:; and 24,7,2: tells us that his wishes are fulfilled by certain rites, however we did not hear the contents of those wishes. P. Br. 18,7,1: shows us Prajāpati longing for vigour. In the same way Agni is desirous of glory (P. Br. 6,5,6:) or of food (14,3,19:). So is Indra longing for glamour and energy cf. P. Br. 6,5,6: and 14,9,34: and desirous to drive away his enemies cf. P. Br. 19,18,2:.

Elsewhere we see Bṛhaspati craving for the function of *purohita* P. Br. 17,11,4: 19,17,8:.

Having desires betrays weakness, as a *desire* is something that is not fulfilled yet, and it often implies that the persons concerned are not able to materialize those desires by their own power. However, we could add to this: the utterance of those desires might be in the eyes of the Indian already a kind of explosion of mighty power and so the *devas* could be able to proceed to creation. cf. P. Br. 6,5,1: "Prajāpati desired: "may I be more (than one), may I be reproduced". "He languished and out of the head of him who languished the sun was created (or came forth, came into existence). This (sun) struck off his head: that became the *droṇakalaśa*, therein the gods took their soma-draughts." But mostly P. Br. gives us evidently to understand that desire has to be considered as a physical or psychical weakness, only helped by rites and prayers and *tapas* "austerities". We can discover ourselves that nearly every passage speaking of Prajāpati's or other's desires mentions at the very same moment the fulfilling of that wish by one or another rite. J. Br. often speaks about the wishes of the *devas* in genere § 5 *te 'bruvann etemaṃ jigīṣāmeti* cf. also: § 15: 19. 47: 49: 65:. Here also we meet Prajāpati as being anxious; in § 41: longing and looking for some power to retain over his own creatures. He wishes to overcome death § 128: and at times his desires are even lewd and malicious. P. Br. 8,2,10: and J. Br. § 207:. They are incestuous.

Elsewhere we encounter Indra wishing to kill Vṛtra J. Br. § 73: and again it is Prajāpati, who supports him and offers him the Vajra in the shape of a *ṣoḍaśin* verse. Even Varuṇa is desirous and ambitious to receive the absolute supremacy over the *devas* J. Br. § 188.

J. Up. Br. gives the same picture but it gives me the impression that it is a reminiscence of older sacred lore to be found in P. Br. and J. Br. Twice we encounter Prajāpati longing for progeny J. Up. Br. 1,46,1· *So (prajāpatiḥ) 'kāmayata bahus syām prajāyeya bhūmānaṃ gaccheyam iti:* and about the same is to be found in 3,15,4:. Some few passages mention the *devas* as a group desiring the possession of a certain *sāman* J. Up. Br. 1,51,3: and 1,58,8: and in 2,3,4: the *devas* and *ṛṣis* together desire the defeat of the *asuras*.

we are exhausted by the two other pressings. *Te 'bruvan, na śakṣyāmaḥ.* So § 53 presents Indra to us in pursuit of some one. He is not able to catch him. *tāṃ hendro jighṛkṣan na śaśāka grahītum,* cf. also § 66, and 179: where Indra has to admit his *na śakṣyāmi.*

The entire § 63 reveals us the lack of omnipotent force of the *devas.* They are able to conquer the Universe in parts only. Reading this paragraph, we are convinced they are too human, too humanly weak. § 182 mentions the *devas* as trying to succeed in lifting up, but they could not, so they had to recur to Prajāpati for support. *tā devā nodayacchaṃs; tāḥ prajāpataya eva punaḥ prayacchan.*

J. Up. Br. 2,7,11: relates to us that the hymns can dispose of the *Asuras* and *devas* alike: *Sa hovāca devān eva devaloke dadhyām, manuṣyān manuṣyaloke, pitṛn pitṛloke* etc. It is by force of the *Udgītha* that Ayāsya Aṅgirasa is able to do so. cf. J. Up. Br. 4,14,6:. Even Indra can be overpowered by vows and penance: *ta u śrameṇa tapasā vratacaryeṇendram avarurudhire.*

f) The *devas,* just like any human being, need very badly food and air. Prajāpati after his creating the universe, feeling exhausted, needs some food for recuperation of strength. cf. P. Br. 4,10,1:. So we hear Agni devouring the food of the *devas* cf. P. Br. 14,3,19: 17,8,3:, and elsewhere we learn that the *devas* eat their own food, and that is the *sāman* P. Br. 6,4,13: cf. also 11,5,21: 7,3,26:. They eat their offerings. P. Br. 18,1,11: and ghee. P. Br. 18,2,6:.

J. Br. § 23 shows us that: *pavamānena vai devebhyo 'nnādyaṃ pradīyate,* and § 86 *annam ... vai devānāṃ somo rājā.* "Food of the *devas* is king soma". Their nourishment is the sacrifice § 97, and they live on our human gifts § 200 *itaḥpradānād dhi devā jīvanty.* They are sometimes hungry, § 38 and § 88 (some of the *devas* died of starvation) and J. Up. Br. 3,20,1: confirms this our theory. Agni receives the epithet *annāda* and in J. Up. Br. 4,11,5: he is praised as *ahaṃ devānām mukham, ... ahaṃ devānām annaṃ vikaromy:* "I transform the food of the *devas*". In J. Up. Br. 2,11,10: the *devas* beg for a share in the food: *anu na etasminn annādya ābhaja.* And the same work relates to us that as the *pitaras,* men and beasts etc. are living on air, and the *devas* as well; cf. 1,41,11:.

That they are unable to realize every one of their wishes, is proved by the multitude of passages throughout the Brāhmaṇas, and it is interesting that the mightiest among the *devas* Prajāpati, Agni and Indra foster the most powerful desires.

g) Another epithet of the *devas* is that they desire a great many things. Prajāpati desired to have company, as he felt lonely in the beginning of time: *agre* cf. P. Br. 4,1,4:. In short Prajāpati longs for creation cf. P. Br. 6,1,1: 6: 8: 6,5,1: 7,5,1: 6,1: 10,3,1:.

Prajāpati desires and craves for light P. Br. 16,1,1:; and 24,7,2: tells us that his wishes are *fulfilled by certain rites*, however we did *not hear the contents* of those wishes. P. Br. 18,7,1: shows us Prajāpati *longing* for vigour. In the same way Agni is desirous of glory (P. Br. 6,5,6:) or of food (14,3,19:). So is Indra longing for glamour and energy cf. P. Br. 6,5,6: and 14,9,34: and desirous to drive away his enemies cf. P. Br. 19,18,2:.

Elsewhere we see Bṛhaspati craving for the function of *purohita* P. Br. 17,11,4: 19,17,8:.

Having desires betrays weakness, as a desire is something that is not fulfilled yet, and it often implies that the persons concerned are not able to materialize those desires by their own power. However, we could add to this: *the utterance of those desires might be in the eyes of the Indian already a kind of explosion of mighty power and* so the *devas* could be able to proceed to creation. cf. P. Br. 6,5,1: "Prajāpati desired: "may I be more (than one), may I be reproduced". "He languished and out of the head of him who languished the sun was created (or came forth, came into existence). This (sun) struck off his head: that became the *droṇakalaśa*, therein the gods took their soma-draughts." But mostly P. Br. gives us evidently to understand that desire has to be considered as a physical or psychical weakness, only helped by rites and prayers and *tapas* "*austerities*". *We can discover* ourselves that nearly every passage speaking of Prajāpati's or other's desires mentions at the very same moment the fulfilling of that wish by one or another rite. J. Br. often speaks about the wishes of the *devas* in genere § 5 *te 'bruvann etemam jigīṣāmeti* cf. also. § 15: 19: 47: 49: 65.. Here also we meet Prajāpati as being anxious; *in* § 41: *longing* and looking for some power to retain over his own creatures. He wishes to overcome death § 128: and at times his desires are even lewd and malicious. P. Br. 8,2,10: and J. Br. § 207:. They are incestuous.

Elsewhere we encounter Indra wishing to kill Vṛtra J. Br. § 73: and again it is Prajāpati, who supports him and offers him the Vajra in the shape of a *ṣoḍaśin* verse. Even Varuṇa is desirous and ambitious to receive the absolute supremacy over the *devas* J. Br. § 188.

J. Up. Br. gives the same picture but it gives me the impression that it is a reminiscence of older sacred lore to be found in P. Br. and J. Br. Twice we encounter Prajāpati longing for progeny J. Up. Br. 1,46,1: So (*prajāpati*) *'kāmayata bahus syām prajāyeya bhūmānam gaccheyam iti*; and about the same is to be found in 3,15,4:. Some few passages mention the *devas* as a group desiring the possession of a certain *sāman* J. Up. Br. 1,51,3: and 1,58,8: and in 2,3,4: the *devas* and *ṛṣis* together desire the defeat of the *asuras*.

we are exhausted by the two other pressings. *Te 'bruvan, na śakṣyāmaḥ.* So § 53 presents Indra to us in pursuit of some one. He is not able to catch him. *tāṃ hendro jighṛkṣan na śaśāka grahītum,* cf. also § 66, and 179: where Indra has to admit his *na śakṣyāmi.*

The entire § 63 reveals us the lack of omnipotent force of the *devas.* They are able to conquer the Universe in parts only. Reading this paragraph, we are convinced they are too human, too humanly weak. § 182 mentions the *devas as trying to succeed in lifting up, but they* could not, so they had to recur to Prajāpati for support. *tā devā nodayacchaṃs; tāḥ prajāpataya eva punaḥ prayacchan.*

J. Up. Br. 2,7,11: relates to us that the hymns can dispose of the *Asuras* and *devas* alike: *Sa hovāca devān eva devaloke dadhyām, manuṣyān manuṣyaloke, pitṛn pitrloke* etc. It is by force of the *Udgītha* that Ayāsya Aṅgirasa is able to do so. cf. J. Up. Br. 4,14,6:. Even Indra can be overpowered by vows and penance: *ta u śrameṇa tapasā vratacaryeṇendram avarurudhire.*

f) The *devas,* just like any human being, need very badly food and air. Prajāpati after his creating the universe, feeling exhausted, needs some food for recuperation of strength. cf. P. Br. 4,10,1:. So we hear Agni devouring the food of the *devas* cf. P. Br. 14,3,19: 17,8,3:, and elsewhere we learn that the *devas* eat their own food, and that is the *sāman* P. Br. 6,4,13: cf. also 11,5,21: 7,3,26:. They eat their offerings. P. Br. 18,1,11: and ghee. P. Br. 18,2,6:.

J. Br. § 23 shows us that: *pavamānena vai devebhyo 'nnādyaṃ pradīyate,* and § 86 *annam ... vai devānāṃ somo rājā.* "Food of the *devas* is king soma". Their nourishment is the sacrifice § 97, and they live on our human gifts § 200 *itaḥpradānād dhi devā jīvanty.* They are sometimes hungry, § 38 and § 88 (some of the *devas* died of starvation) and J. Up. Br. 3,20,1: confirms this our theory. Agni receives the epithet *annāda* and in *J. Up. Br.* 4,11,5: *he is praised as ahaṃ devānām mukham,... ahaṃ devānām annaṃ vikaromy:* "I transform the food of the *devas*". In J. Up. Br. 2,11,10: the *devas* beg for a share in the food: *anu na etasminn annādya ābhaja.* And the same work relates to us that as the *pitaras,* men and beasts etc. are living on air, and the *devas* as well; cf. 1,41,11:.

That they are unable to realize every one of their wishes, is proved by the multitude of passages throughout the Brāhmaṇas, and it is interesting that the mightiest among the *devas* Prajāpati, Agni and Indra foster the most powerful desires.

g) Another epithet of the *devas* is that they desire a great many things. Prajāpati desired to have company, as he felt lonely in the beginning of time: *agre* cf. P. Br. 4,1,4:. In short Prajāpati longs for creation cf. P. Br. 6,1,1: 6: 8: 6,5,1: 7,5,1: 6,1: 10,3,1:.

upait tā atoṣayat "Then he saw this (hymn) and he recited it with stause at the end and he enforced his will upon them".

Indra needs the rites and hymns against the Vṛtra, cf. P. Br. 8,5,2: 12,6,6: 14,4,5: 12,13,23: and he drives his evil adversary away by the strength of the *Vighana* stoma, cf. P. Br. 19,18,2:. He earns his victories only by the rites and sacred songs, cf. P. Br. 16,4,6: 23,10,2:.

The *devas* as a group are in need of them very, very badly. They need them for recalling Indra cf. P. Br. 8,5,11: and for conquering this world cf. P. Br. 9,2,9: 10,12,3: 4: 20,1,3: and 20,3,4: 22,8,4:; cf. also 16,4,6:. They want them for the defeat of the *asuras* P. Br. 9,1,1: etc. 2,7,2: 20,8,12: and cf. also J. Br. § 16, and J. Up. Br. 1,16,4: 60,6: 7:.

The *devas* thrive by these rites cf. P. Br. 24,1,13: 24,12,8:.

Only by applying these rites Bṛhaspati becomes the *devānām purohita* cf. P. Br. 17,11,4: 19,17,8:. By these rites the *devas* became *devas*: cf. P. Br. 22,11,2: 6: *etena vai devā devatvam agacchan* and 23,6,2: *etābhir vai devā devatvam agacchan devatvaṃ gacchanti ya etā upayanti*. So Vāyu attained sovereignty over the animals of this earth by the 19-day-rite, cf. P. Br. 23,13,2:. Agni sets the Universe into motion by rites cf. P. Br. 25,9,2: just like Savitṛ P. Br. 24,15,2: and Prajāpati 25,6,2: 17,2:. Mitra Varuṇa obtained these worlds in this manner P. Br. 25,10,10:. J. Br. only dwells a few times on this topic, yet quite evidently reveals that the devas obtain their goals by *udbhid* and *utsedha*, cf. J. Br. § 131.

Prajāpati earns his due respect from his creatures by sacrifice only: *sa etam yajñam apaśyat* (P. Br. passim). So Indra gained his supremacy among the *devas* by means of a sacrifice: *tato vā indraḥ sarveṣām devānāṃ jraiṣṭhyam agacchad* J. Br. § 141 *tam āharat; tenainam ayājayat; sa heṣṭvaiva sarvā mṛdho vyahata.*

i) The *devas* practise meditation to reach their aims.

So in P. Br. 7,6,1· Prajāpati meditated silently, in his mind, and what was in his mind became the bṛhat: *sa tūṣṇīṃ manasā dhyāyat tasya yan manasyāsīt tad bṛhat samabhavat.*

They practise *tapas* "austerities".

P. Br. 12,5,23: says that *devās tapo 'tapyanta: ta etad ariṣṭam apaśyan*. So Agni became an eater of food after his *tapas*. P. Br. 14,3,19: and Indra desiring honour and energy practised *tapas* as well cf. P. Br. 14,11,37:. Even the Aṅgirases did so cf. P. Br. 20,11,3: and the *devas* as group cf. P. Br. 25,5,3:.

It often happens that the *tapas* gives them enlightment and so they find the proper rite or receive a vision of the hymns and by practising or performing them, they succeed. J. Br. § 65 presents the devas to us longing for heaven: *devā vai svargakāmās tapo 'tapyanta.*

h) Closely connected with the points related above is the everywhere revealed viewpoint of the Vedic Indian that the *devas* are much dependent on hymns and rites in order to reach their aims. I dare not say that the *devas* could not achieve their ends in any other way, but often the texts themselves say that such is the case: cf. P. Br. 4,1,4:, that Prajāpati desired to be multiplied in creatures and by seeing the overnight rite, he practised it and by doing so he begot day and night. *Prajāpatir vā idam eka āsīt. so 'kāmayata bahuḥ syāṃ prajāyeyeti sa etam atirātram apaśyat tam āharat tenāhorātre prājanayat.* Elsewhere we come across the fact that the *devas* use all kind of rites to reach heaven, mostly after having a vision wherein the existence of the rite concerned, is disclosed to them [2]).

In note 2 I intentionally gave all those passages concerned with reaching heaven, because every book of the P. Br. seems to find it necessary to express this very thought: hymns and rites are so important *as the devas themselves attained their heaven (implicitly may* be surmised: *deva*hood) by performing those rites and making use of those hymns. J. Br., though far less than P. Br., expresses the same opinion cf. § 22 *rauraveṇa vai devā ūrdhvāḥ svargaṃ lokam ārohan.* cf. also § 32 and § 81.

J. Up. Br. 1,15,3: 5: says the same, but 1,15,1: confirms my first theory that at least sometimes the *devas* were absolutely unable to reach and attain their ultimate end, heaven, except by the performance of rites: *devā vai svargaṃ lokam āipsan. taṃ na śayānā nāsīnā na tiṣṭhanto na dhāvanto nai 'va kenacana karmaṇāpnuvan.* They could not do so by sheer lack of power. Only as Prajāpati handed to them the *ṛc*-less *sāman*, they were able to perform it. But they needed hymns and rites for quite a number of other ends. *So P. Br. 4,5,2: 3: 9: for* restoring the sun to heaven, cf. also P. Br. 4,6,13: 6,7,24: 12,10,6: 23,16,2: 24,6,2:, for restoring the collapsed day cf. P. Br. 12,3,10: 15,3,9:. *So Prajāpati needs those rites for the act of creation cf.* P. Br. 6,1,1: 2: 8,5,6: and 6,3: cf. also 23,14,2: 23,9,2: 20,3,2: 4: and 25,6,2:. Prajāpati gained endlessly by rites cf. P. Br. 23,11,2: and 23,25,2: 24,9,2:, *he receives a firm support in this world cf.* P. Br. 23,18,2: and he obtained all food cf. P. Br. 23,21,2: 23,27,1:. So Prajāpati reached the fulfilment of all his wishes cf. P. Br. 24,7,2:. He receives Vitality "Immortality" by those rites. cf. J. Up. Br. 3,40,1: (and the *devas* and *ṛṣis* as well) *tad etad amṛtaṃ gāyatram etena vāi prajāpatir amṛtatvam agacchad etena devā etena ṛṣayaḥ.* Prajāpati wants them, in order to reach supremacy and paramountcy over *devas* and creatures cf. P. Br. 6,3,9: 16,16,2: 23,14,3: cf. also J. Br. § 18 *katham nv id yā ahaṃ prajāḥ sṛjeya, tā mā sṛṣṭā nāpacāyeyur iti:* "How and why does it happen that my own creatures refuse to honour me after being created?" *Sa etat sāmāpaśyat; tenāstuta: sa stauṣa ity eva nidhanam*

is more dogmatic: *yad vai manuṣyāṇām pratyakṣan tad devānām parokṣam atha yan manuṣyāṇām parokṣan tad devānām pratyakṣam*: "what is evident to men is hidden to the *devas* and what is evident to the *devas* is hidden to the human beings". This expression that the gods like and love "the cryptic" is characteristic for primitive mentality. They have to point out to us some difference between *devas* and human beings, so they find a means for this by making their characteristics opposite or complementary. Vroklage in his Godsdienst der Primitieven (p. 55) states the same: "Bij vele primitieve volken leeft het besef, dat het in de andere wereld heel anders toegaat" and he quotes J. D. v. d. Bergh MSC., speaking of the mentality of the people of Banggai who believe that what is high here, is low there, and what is above there is below here. Here one could conclude an important difference between *devas* and men. To us "men" the *devas* behave like foreigners and strangers. They see what we cannot see and they are unable to discern what is clear to earthly people. They live in another world. This implies of course a knowledge hidden to us, by which the *devas* are able to look into the depths of human hearts and what is in the future. Though never looked upon as omniscient the *devas* are still praised as being gifted with special knowledge.

In P. Br. 23,16,2: we meet the gods looking for a means of repair after the demon Svarbhānu committed some mischief. They are seeking and the 21 day-rite gives them relief. J. Br. mentions Prajāpati as unable to distinguish the different animals §52: *tān (paśūn prajāpatir) ekarūpān na vyajānāt*. And § 142 presents Indra after having killed Vṛtra, and he is greatly afraid and in great doubt about the result.

1) The *devas* are militant.

P. Br., J. Br. and J. Up. Br. seem to be very much impressed by the battle raging between *devas* and *asuras*. Every brāhmana [illegible] [illegible] was going on between the Aryan invaders and the native defenders, both represented by their gods and protecting powers. I am still in doubt about the truth of it, as the same fight was going on in Iran and there the outcome was quite different. There the *Asuras* were winning, in India they were losing and yet the fact remains that the Aryan invaders were winning in both countries and overcame the native people. One might adhere to the opinion of Dr. Sri Nivasa in Anthropos, I, 1914, p. 1—15: the Aryans dit not bring culture to India, but the native and dark-skinned Indian (or Dravidian) offered their highstanding culture to

cf. also § 143, and § 182 relates that the *devas* were only able to defeat the *asuras* after practising *tapas*. J. Up. Br. 1,8,12: suggests that the *devas* after *tapas* became equal to Prajāpati. One more quotation from J. Up. Br. 2,1,2: where the *devas* are praised because they overcame death by udgātrā: *te 'dhriyanta tenodgātrā dikṣāmahai yenāpahatya mṛtyum apahatya pāpmānaṃ svargaṃ lokam iyāmeti.* cf. also J. Up. Br. 2,7,2:.

j) The *devas* have no supremacy.

The late-Vedic Indian was quite convinced that the *devas* were not omnipotent. He expresses his conviction clearly. The *devas* fought for supremacy and acquired a partial paramountcy; thus Vāyu in P. Br. 23,13,2: as we mentioned already above.

But elsewhere we also find a number of passages where the *devas* fought for it and it is said that they could master it only by a conquest. P. Br. 7,8,2: presents Prajāpati and Agni discussing to whom a certain beautiful thing belonged. Indra and the *viśve devas* take part in the conversation. Only after compromising the debate was settled. So the *devas* attained their supremacy only by using a certain *sāman* and we must not forget that this supremacy is only over the animals. P. Br. 14,9,12:, cf. also P. Br. 15,3,30: where we meet Varuṇa acquiring supremacy over the *devas*, but succeeding only after applying the *devasthāna-sāman*. The same we hear about Prajāpati in P. Br. 16,4,1: and Indra in 16,4,4: and though this paramount power has to be shared by three, this does not cause the slightest difficulty to the Indian mind in that age.

J. Br. tells how Prajāpati received his paramountcy § 18 and § 133. But this receiving of the supreme position never happens on account of inner dignity, but always because of a hymn or rite or even through knowledge cf. J. Up. Br. 1,1,1: 2: and 1,8,1: cf. also 2: 12:, J. Up. Br. 1,50,1: also points the same way — only by battle and conquest the *devas* were able to rise to paramountcy.

Sometimes during my research I had the impression that every Brāhmaṇa made a point of proving that, however mighty and powerful the *devas* might have been, the rites and sacred hymns were far more powerful. And that only by applying those rites and by their inherent force, the *devas* could attain their *deva*-hood and *deva*-position.

k) The *devas* are not omniscient.

P. Br. 6,9,22: deals with the Gandharva Viśvāvasu, when he had stolen the *soma* and the *devas* searched for it everywhere. The *devas* apparently did not know where to find it: *tam devatā anvaicchan.* The same we come across in P. Br. 14,4,7: where *devas* and Indra are at a loss to understand where the *ṛṣis* might have gone. P. Br. 22,10,3:

is more dogmatic: *yad vai manuṣyānāṃ pratyakṣan tad devānāṃ parokṣam atha yan manuṣyānāṃ parokṣan tad devānāṃ pratyakṣam*: "what is evident to men is hidden to the *devas* and what is evident to the *devas* is hidden to the human beings". This expression that the gods like and love "the cryptic" is characteristic for primitive mentality. They have to point out to us some difference between *devas* and human beings, so they find a means for this by making their characteristics opposite or complementary. Vroklage in his Godsdienst der Primitieven (p. 55) states the same: "Bij vele primitieve volken leeft het besef, dat het in de andere wereld heel anders toegaat" and he quotes J. D. v. d. Bergh MSC., speaking of the mentality of the people of Banggai who believe that what is high here, is low there, and what is above there is below here. Here one could conclude an important difference between *devas* and men. To us "men" the *devas* behave like foreigners and strangers. They see what we cannot see and they are unable to discern what is clear to earthly people. They live in another world. This implies of course a knowledge hidden to us, by which the *devas* are able to look into the depths of human hearts and what is in the future. Though never looked upon as omniscient the *devas* are still praised as being gifted with special knowledge.

In P. Br. 23,16,2: we meet the gods looking for a means of repair after the demon Svarbhānu committed some mischief. They are seeking and the 21 day-rite gives them relief. J. Br. mentions Prajāpati as unable to distinguish the different animals §52: *tān (paśūn prajāpatir) ekarūpān na vyajānāt*. And § 142 presents Indra after having killed Vṛtra, and he is greatly afraid and in great doubt about the result.

1) The *devas* are militant.

P. Br., J. Br. and J. Up. Br. seem to be very much impressed by the battle raging between *devas* and *asuras*. Every brāhmaṇa gives us numberless passages wh[illegible]
pity that all those p[illegible]
what in those days th[illegible]
here a story of the [illegible] was going on between the Aryan invaders and the native defenders, both represented by their gods and protecting powers. I am still in doubt about the truth of it, as the same fight was going on in Iran and there the outcome was quite different. There the *Asuras* were winning, in India they were losing and yet the fact remains that the Aryan invaders were winning in both countries and overcame the native people. One might adhere to the opinion of Dr. Sri Nivasa in Anthropos, I, 1914, p. 1—15: the Aryans did not bring culture to India, but the native and dark-skinned Indian (or Dravidian) offered their highstanding culture to

cf. also § 143, and § 182 relates that the *devas* were only able to defeat the *asuras* after practising *tapas*. J. Up. Br. 1,8,12: suggests that the *devas* after *tapas* became equal to Prajāpati. One more quotation from J. Up. Br. 2,1,2: where the *devas* are praised because they overcame death by udgātrā: *te 'dhriyanta tenodgātrā dīkṣāmahai yenāpahatya mṛtyum apahatya pāpmānaṃ svargaṃ lokam iyāmeti.* cf. also J. Up. Br. 2,7,2:.

j) The *devas* have no supremacy.

The late-Vedic Indian was quite convinced that the *devas* were not omnipotent. He expresses his conviction clearly. The *devas* fought for supremacy and acquired a partial paramountcy; thus Vāyu in P. Br. 23,13,2: *as we mentioned already above.*

But elsewhere we also find a number of passages where the *devas* fought for it and it is said that they could master it only by a conquest. P. Br. 7,8,2: presents Prajāpati and Agni discussing to whom a certain beautiful thing belonged. Indra and the *viśve devas* take part in the conversation. Only after compromising the debate was settled. So the *devas* attained their supremacy only by using a certain *sāman* and *we must not forget that this supremacy is only over the* animals. P. Br. 14,9,12:, cf. also P. Br. 15,3,30: where we meet Varuṇa acquiring supremacy over the *devas*, but succeeding only after applying the *devasthāna-sāman.* The same we hear about Prajāpati in P. Br. 16,4,1: and Indra in 16,4,4: and though this paramount power has to be shared by three, this does not cause the slightest difficulty to the Indian mind in that age.

J. Br. tells how Prajāpati received his paramountcy § 18 and § 133. *But this receiving of the supreme position never* happens on account of inner dignity, but always because of a hymn or rite or even through knowledge cf. J. Up. Br. 1,1,1: 2: and 1,8,1: cf. also 2: 12:, J. Up. Br. 1,50,1: also points the same way — only by battle and conquest the *devas* were able to rise to paramountcy.

Sometimes during my research I had the impression that every Brāhmaṇa made a point of proving that, however mighty and powerful the *devas might have been*, the rites and sacred hymns were far more powerful. And that only by applying those rites and by their inherent force, the *devas* could attain their *deva*-hood and *deva*-position.

k) The *devas* are not omniscient.

P. Br. 6,9,22: *deals with the* Gandharva Viśvāvasu, when he had stolen the *soma* and the *devas* searched for it everywhere. The *devas* apparently did not know where to find it: *tam devatā anvaicchan.* The same we come across in *P. Br. 14,4,7: where devas* and Indra are at a loss to understand where the *ṛṣis* might have gone. P. Br. 22,10,3:

is more dogmatic: *yad vai manuṣyāṇāṃ pratyakṣan tad devānāṃ parokṣam atha yan manuṣyāṇāṃ parokṣan tad devānāṃ pratyakṣaṃ*: "what is evident to men is hidden to the *devas* and what is evident to the *devas* is hidden to the human beings". This expression that the gods like and love "the cryptic" is characteristic for primitive mentality. They have to point out to us some difference between *devas* and human beings, so they find a means for this by making their characteristics opposite or complementary. Vroklage in his Godsdienst der Primitieven (p. 55) states the same: "Bij vele primitieve volken leeft het besef, dat het in de andere wereld heel anders toegaat" and he quotes J. D. v. d. Bergh MSC., speaking of the mentality of the people of Banggai who believe that what is high here, is low there, and what is above there is below here. Here one could conclude an important difference between *devas* and men. To us "men" the *devas* behave like foreigners and strangers. They see what we cannot see and they are unable to discern what is clear to earthly [illegible] upon as omniscient the *devas* are still praised as being gifted with special knowledge.

In P. Br. 23,16,2: we meet the gods looking for a means of repair after the demon Svarbhānu committed some mischief. They are seeking and the 21 day-rite gives them relief. J. Br. mentions Prajāpati as unable to distinguish the different animals §52: *tān (paśūn prajāpatir) ekarūpān na vyajānāt*. And § 142 presents Indra after having killed Vṛtra, and he is greatly afraid and in great doubt about the result.

l) The *devas* are militant.

P. Br., J. Br. and J. Up. Br. seem to be very much impressed by the battle raging between *devas* and *asuras*. Every brāhmaṇa gives us numberless passages where this fearsome struggle is mentioned. It is a pity that all those passages cannot give us some clear conception of what in those days the Indians saw in this warfare. Scholars surmised here a story of the battle that was going on between the Aryan invaders and the native defenders, both represented by their gods and protecting powers. I am still in doubt about the truth of it, as the same fight was going on in Iran and there the outcome was quite different. There the *Asuras* were winning, in India they were losing and yet the fact remains that the Aryan invaders were winning in both countries and overcame the native people. One might adhere to the opinion of Dr. Sri Nivasa in Anthropos, I, 1914, p. 1—15: the Aryans dit not bring culture to India, but the native and darkskinned Indian (or Dravidian) offered their highstanding culture to

the Aryan invaders. In short: in his opinion the south Indian Dravida is the cultured stock. We may remember here that Dr. Sri Nivasa himself is of Dravidian descent. There is a rift developping the last 60 years between the North and South Indian. It could be, anyhow, that the Aryans were forced to take over some *devas* of the substratum-population, where the Aryans invading Iran could keep up the cult of their own: the *asuras*. Notwithstanding Dr. Sri Nivasa's racial background there may be still a good deal of truth in his opinion. After all, nomadic life (the Aryan way of life till they settled in India) could not be accepted as the best substratum for "high culture", and not a few "Indian traits" in culture could be possibly explained by thorough research among those aboriginal tribes. However the author of the historia Mundi II seems to be right in believing that one should not over-value the influence of those oldest periods.

So what is at the back of this *deva-asura* struggle I dare not even suggest, especially as nowhere the context gives any indication for a certain direction nor can any hypothesis find good backing from citations.

Some texts relate only the struggle between *devas* and *asuras* in a matter-of-fact way, *devāsurā aspardhanta* J. Br. § 14: 15: 26: 37: 49: 132: 174: 187:. Elsewhere we find the fact mentioned that the *devas* won the battle cf. P. Br. 2,7,2: [5]), and sometimes the texts give us the suggestion that the battle was very fierce and hard for the *devas*; cf. P. Br. 7,5,11: 9,1,1,: etc., 12,5,23: 13,27: where we find that by Prajāpati's interference the *devas* won; cf. also P. Br. 22,17,2: 21,13,2: and J. Br. § 16: 22: 63: 67: 74: 155: 172: 182: and in J. Up. Br. 1,49,1 : 2: "the Gods overcame every adverse force"; cf. P. Br. 13,7,10: also 13,8,1b: 4b: 5:. The *devas* even fought death cf. J. Br. § 5. So we see that the *devas* fought a warfare about supremacy or about some possessions. The victory did go to the *devas*, but only after support and assistance from Prajāpati or else with the help of sacrifice, rites and hymns. Here we may also insert that the *devas* were lovers of races; cf. P. Br. 7,2,1: 9,1,35:.

But there are some worse traits in their bellicose attitude; they fought each other: cf. J. Br. § 136: *ādityāi ca vā aṅgirasaś ca svarge loke 'spardhanta*. And J. Up. Br. 4,11,2: *tāi śraiṣṭhye vyavadantā 'ham śreṣṭhā 'smy aham śreṣṭhā 'smy mām śriyam upādhvam iti.*

m) In connexion with this topic the Brāhmaṇas also state that the *devas* can be hurtful to human beings cf. P. Br. 1,5,6: where we pray: *soma rārandhi no hṛdi pitā nosi mama tan mā māhiṃsīḥ*. Or P. Br. 6,5,12: where the *devas* curse at each other. Here the *devas* curse at the trees in which Vāc was hiding: "for they (the trees) had been cursed by the gods": *devaśaptā hi.*

n) To conclude the research on the more physical aspect of the *devas* we came to know in P. Br. 6,9,15: 16: that Prajāpati created the *devas* just like other creatures, and 16 does not exclude the danger of annihilation for the *devas*: *yad eta iti tasmād yāvanta evāgre devās tāvanta idānīm* "In that (he said) "these", therefore all the gods that (were) in the beginning (exist) even now." One could conclude that the Indians would not be surprised at all if the gods perished.

o) We might suggest a moral question. Do the Brāhmaṇas reveal to us *devas* with morals? This will give us some opportunity to learn what the Vedic Indian thought about sin.

P. Br. 1,6,10: *devakṛtasyainaso 'vayajanam asi*: "thou art the annulment of the guilt of the *devas*". It is a pity that there does not [illegible] "guilt of the gods". Yet, some [illegible] the fact that the ancestors and we' are mentioned on the same level as the *devas*. So the *devas* could have been considered to sin like every human being.

P. Br. 4,9,14: where the *devas* abuse Prajāpati of-course for his evil deeds. These wicked acts seem to have been widely known. Caland p. 66 of his translation of the P. Br. says: "the abusing of Prajāpati consists according to Drāhyāyana (9,4,17—18:) either in mentioning the evil deeds of Prajāpati, or in repeating the evil deeds done by Prajāpati as recorded by the Adhvaryus and the ṛgvedins. From the ṛgvedins is known the tale of the incest of Prajāpati (Ait. Br. 3,33: and S. Br. 1,7,4:)." But in P. Br. 8,2,10: we hear the old narration of Prajāpati's incestuous desires towards his daughter Usas: *Prajāpatir uṣasam adhyait svāṃ duhitaram*, and we find it mentioned again in J. Br. § 207. We know that to the Indian mind killing is always murder. To kill someone in battle is a sin as every plain murder. So we find related that Indra was very upset about the fact that he gave the *yatis* as a prey to the hyenas; cf. P. Br. 14,11,29: 18,1,9: 19,4,7: and he deemed himself impure. So P. Br. 22,14,2: mentions Indra being anxious after slaying the *asuras*: "Indra having slain the *asuras* conceived that he had done an unheard-of deed". Especially since fratricide is a special crime in the eyes of the people of caste. J. Br. § 140 and 149 relate Indra to us as a thief. P. Br. 19,19,1: shows us Indra disturbed by ungodly illusions *Indram adevyo māyā asacanta*. Would this prove that the Indian in those days had some moral feelings about evil thoughts? Or could it be that P. Br. means to narrate implicitly about strange powers trying to master Indra? The commentators render *māyā* by *vañcanāḥ* "illusions" or "hallucinations". Quite a number of Indian people believe that these illusions owe their origin to the demons or devils obsessing them for a short or longer while. Can this explain Indra's resort to Prajāpati?

J. Br. § 140 already gives us some list of sins: murder, someone to deliver to the wild animals and back answering Bṛhaspati. § 149 suggests theft (of the Maruts). Another epithet with unpleasant contents is the title: *sorcerer of the devas: devānāṃ yātuḥ*; cf. P. Br. 1,6,7:. In the Vedic age one did not like the sorcerers and even now-a-days one hates the so-called sorcerers and finds something immoral in their acts of sorcery.

p) After all these facts we ourselves would infer that there is no essential difference between *devas* and human beings, and even the Indian seems to feel the same way. In a great number of passages he states quite clearly that even human beings can reach the state of life granted to the *devas*, provided he makes use of the ways and means that are open to the *devas*. So:

1) "Immortality" or "vitality of the *devas*". P. Br. 1,8,2: says: *Varuṇas tvā nayatu devi dakṣiṇe varuṇāyāśvaṃ tenāmṛtatvam aśīya vayo dātre bhūyān mayo mahyam pratigṛhītre*: "Let Varuṇa lead thee, O divine Dakṣiṇa, the horse to Varuṇa. Thereby may I obtain vitality, may life fall to the share of the giver, joy to me the receiver". Yet, P. Br. 24,19,2: explains that man's immortality is, that he reaches the normal term of life, that he becomes wealthier: *manuṣyasyāmṛtatvaṃ yat sarvam āyur eti vasīyān bhavati*. J. Br. § 108 expresses the idea mentioned above: that also we men are able to become "immortals": *atha . . . te 'jāyanta (devās); te sarva eva sāṅgāḥ satanavo 'mṛtāḥ samabhavan; sarvo haivo sāṅgaḥ satanur amṛtaḥ sambhavati, ya evaṃ veda*. So knowledge is the means that brought *devas* so far: so it will do us. J. Up. Br. 1,5,7: *sa yathocchrāyam pratiyasya prapadyetaivam evaitayā devatayedam amṛtam abhiparyeti yatrāyam idaṃ taptīti* "as one would approach an elevation, toiling towards it, even thus by means of this divinity one compasses this immortality where this one here burns". So also P. Br. 1,6,5: where we learn that we can reach those qualities of "immortality" by knowledge; cf. P. Br. 1,18,10: where the sacred syllable *oṃ* and sacrifice are the means (P. Br. 1,22,8:).

2) The human beings can attain *deva*-hood like the *devas* themselves. P. Br. 17,14,2: *yadā saṃvatsarasya gṛhapatir bhavaty atha vaiśvadevasya mātrām āpnoti* "when he becomes the master of the house of the year (by the agnihotra) he reaches the measure of the *vaiśvadeva*". So P. Br. 18,2,10: teaches us that through the deity *soma* one comes to the deities: *devatayaiva devatā apyeti* [4]); cf. also J. Br. § 127 *ud vayaṃ tamasas pari suvaḥ paśyanto jyotir uttaraṃ devaṃ devatrā sūryam aganma jyotir uttamam ity etāṃ japann udaity*; and J. Up. Br. 3,26,5: *(tṛptir) taṃ devān abhipravahati*: "satisfaction

carries him forth to the devas". And J. Up. Br. 3,33,3: *atha ya enā adhyātmam upāste sa hā 'ntidevo bhavati*: "Now if anyone worships them with regard to self, he becomes the one who is near the *devas*".

3) Even human beings are able to attain heaven.

P. Br. 2,6,2: *etayā vai devāḥ svargaṃ lokam āyan svargakāmaḥ stuvīta svargasya lokasya samaṣṭyai svargāl lokān na cyavate tuṣṭuvānaḥ*. "By means of this (viṣṭuti) the *devas* went to the world of heaven; one who wishes for the world of heaven, should practise this for reaching the world of heaven. After heaving practised this he does not fall forth from the world of heaven"; cf. also P. Br. 5,7,8: 10,3,10: (by soma) 12,4,14: (by the *rathantara* and *bṛhat*) 17,13,18: (by a barley sacrifice) 18,6,4: 8: (by the Vājapeya rite) 18,7,1: 10,5:. J. Br. § 168 ascertains: *te devā devayānena pathaitaṃ svargaṃ lokaṃ gatvāmvāgamān manuṣyānām abibhayus*. "The *devas* having reached heaven following the *deva*path, they were afraid that man would follow them." So the *devas* did not see *any* intrinsic impossibility in the fact, that also human beings could go the way of the *devas*. J. Up. Br. 1,3,2: might also point that same way. 3,14,9: says: that the udgātar brings the sacrificers to the world of the god (the sun) by sacrifice. J. Up. Br. 4,3,10: one reaches heaven through true knowledge; cf. also: 10,1,12:.

4) Also human beings are able to conquer *their* enemies in the same way the *devas* did. P. Br. 2,7,2: *etayā vai devā asurān atyakrāmann ati pāpmānaṃ bhrātrvyaṃ krāmati ya etayā stute*: "By means of this (viṣṭuti) the gods overcame the *Asuras*. He, who practices this in chanting, overcomes his wicked rival"; cf. also P. Br. 19,16,2: 18,2: 19,2: 20,8,1c:. I want to stress this point: man can do what the *devas* are able to do, *if only* he uses the same means. Every passage of those texts reveals this point clearly. However, one might add that the *devas* always found or invented the rites and they enabled also men to make use of them. Man repeats what the *devas* invented or "saw" in a vision.

5) I encountered one passage which even indicates that he who follows Prajāpati in chanting the "horse song", will be able to follow Prajāpati in his act of creation. P. Br. 11,3,5: *aśvo vai bhūtvā prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata sa prājāyata bahur abhavat prajāyate bahur bhavaty aśvena tuṣṭuvānaḥ*.

6) How do human beings succeed in attaining the state or position of the *devas*?

a) by *knowledge*: Here we come across the well-known expression of the Upaniṣads *ya evaṃ veda* cf. P. Br. 4,8,10: 16,4,2: J. Br. § 7:

J. Br. § 140 already gives us some list of sins: murder, someone to deliver to the wild animals and back answering Bṛhaspati. § 149 suggests theft (of the Maruts). Another epithet with unpleasant contents is the title: sorcerer of the *devas*: *devānāṃ yātuḥ*; cf. P. Br. 1,6,7:. In the Vedic age one did not like the sorcerers and even now-a-days one hates the so-called sorcerers and finds something immoral in their acts of sorcery.

p) After all these facts we ourselves would infer that there is no essential difference between *devas* and human beings, and even the Indian seems to feel the same way. In a great number of passages he states quite clearly that even human beings can reach the state of life granted to the *devas*, provided he makes use of the ways and means that are open to the *devas*. So:

1) "Immortality" or "vitality of the *devas*". P. Br. 1,8,2: says: *Varuṇas tvā nayatu devi dakṣiṇe varuṇāyāśvaṃ tenāmṛtatvam aśīya vayo dātre bhūyān mayo mahyam pratigṛhītre*: "Let Varuṇa lead thee, O divine Dakṣiṇa, the horse to Varuṇa. Thereby may I obtain vitality, may life fall to the share of the giver, joy to me the receiver". Yet, P. Br. 24,19,2: explains that man's immortality is, that he reaches the normal term of life, that he becomes wealthier: *manuṣya-syāmṛtatvaṃ yat sarvam āyur eti vasīyān bhavati*. J. Br. § 108 expresses the idea mentioned above: that also we men are able to become "immortals": *atha . . . te 'jāyanta (devās); te sarva eva sāṅgāḥ satanavo 'mṛtāḥ samabhavan; sarvo haivo sāṅgaḥ satanur amṛtaḥ sambhavati, ya evaṃ veda*. So knowledge is the means that brought *devas* so far: so it will do us. J. Up. Br. 1,5,7: *sa yathoccbrāyam pratiyasya prapadyetaivam evaitayā devatayedam amṛtam abhiparyeti yatrāyam idaṃ taptīti* "as one would approach an elevation, toiling towards it, even thus by means of this divinity one compasses this immortality where this one here burns". So also P. Br. 1,6,5: where we learn that we can reach those qualities of "immortality" by knowledge; *cf. P. Br. 1,18,10: where the sacred syllable oṃ and* sacrifice are the means (P. Br. 1,22,8:).

2) The human beings can attain *deva*-hood like the *devas* themselves. P. Br. 17,14,2: *yadā saṃvatsarasya gṛhapatir bhavaty atha vaiśvadevasya mātrām āpnoti* "when he becomes the master of the house of the year (by the agnihotra) he reaches the measure of the *vaiśvadeva*". So P. Br. 18,2,10: teaches us that through the deity *soma* one comes to the deities: *devatayaiva devatā apyeti*[4]); cf. also J. Br. § 127 *ud vayaṃ tamasas pari svaḥ paśyanto jyotir uttaraṃ devaṃ devatrā sūryaṃ aganma jyotir uttamaṃ ity etāṃ japann udaity*; and J. Up. Br. 3,26,5: *(tṛptir) taṃ devān abhipravahati*: "satisfaction

carries him forth to the devas". And J. Up. Br. 3,33,3: *atha ya enā adhyātmam upāste sa hā 'ntidevo bhavati*: "Now if anyone worships them with regard to self, he becomes the one who is near the devas".

3) Even human beings are able to attain heaven.

P. Br. 2,6,2: *etayā vai devāḥ svargaṃ lokam āyan svargakāmaḥ stuvīta svargasya lokasya samaṣṭyai svargāl lokān na cyavate tuṣṭuvānaḥ*. "By means of this (viṣṭuti) the *devas* went to the world of heaven; one who wishes for the world of heaven, should practise this for reaching the world of heaven. After heaving practised this he does not fall forth from the world of heaven"; cf. also P. Br. 5,7,8: 10,3,10: (by soma) 12,4,14: (by the *rathantara* and *bṛhat*) 17,13,18: (by a barley sacrifice) 18,6,4: 8: (by the Vājapeya rite) 18,7,1: 10,5:. J. Br. § 168 ascertains: *te devā devayānena pathaitaṃ svargaṃ lokaṃ gatvānvāgamān manuṣyānām abibhayus*. "The *devas* having reached heaven following the *devapath*, they were afraid that man would follow them." So the *devas* did not see any intrinsic impossibility in the fact, that also human beings could go the way of the *devas*. J. Up. Br. 1,3,2: might also point that same way. 3,14,9: says: that the udgātar brings the sacrificers to the world of the god (the sun) by sacrifice. J. Up. Br. 4,3,10: one reaches heaven through true knowledge; cf. also: 10,1,12:.

4) Also human beings are able to conquer their enemies in the same way the *devas* did. P. Br. 2,7,2: *etayā vai devā asurān atyakrāmann ati pāpmānaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ krāmati ya etayā stute*: "By means of this (viṣṭuti) the gods overcame the *Asuras*. He, who practices this in chanting, overcomes his wicked rival"; cf. also P. Br. 19,16,2: 18,2: 19,2: 20,8,1c:. I want to stress this point: man can do what the *devas* are able to do, if only he uses the same means. Every passage of those texts reveals this point clearly. However, one might add that the *devas* always found or invented the rites and they enabled also men to make use of them. Man repeats what the *devas* invented or "saw" in a vision.

5) I encountered one passage which even indicates that he who follows Prajāpati in chanting the "horse song", will be able to follow Prajāpati in his act of creation. P. Br. 11,3,5: *aśvo vai bhūtvā prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata sa prājāyata bahur abhavat prajāyate bahur bhavaty aiśvena tuṣṭuvānaḥ*.

6) How do human beings succeed in attaining the state or position of the *devas*?

a) by *knowledge*: Here we come across the well-known expression of the Upaniṣads *ya evaṃ veda* cf. P. Br. 4,8,10: 16,4,2: J. Br. § 7:

J. Br. § 140 already gives us some list of sins: *murder*, someone to deliver to the wild animals and back answering Bṛhaspati. § 149 suggests theft (of the Maruts). Another epithet with unpleasant contents is the title: *sorcerer of the devas: devānāṃ yātuḥ*; cf. P. Br. 1,6,7:. In the Vedic age one did not like the sorcerers and even now-a-days one hates the so-called sorcerers and finds something *immoral in their acts of sorcery*.

p) After all these facts we ourselves would infer that there is no essential difference between *devas* and human beings, and even the Indian seems to feel the same way. In a great number of passages he states quite clearly that even human beings can reach the state of life granted to the *devas*, provided he makes use of the ways and means that are open to the *devas*. So:

1) "Immortality" or "vitality of the *devas*". P. Br. 1,8,2: says: *Varuṇas tvā nayatu devi dakṣiṇe varuṇāyāśvaṃ tenāmṛtatvam aśīya vayo dātre bhūyān mayo mahyam pratigṛhītre*: "Let Varuṇa lead thee, O divine Dakṣiṇa, the horse to Varuṇa. Thereby *may I* obtain vitality, may life fall to the share of the giver, joy to me the receiver". Yet, P. Br. 24,19,2: explains that man's immortality is, that he *reaches the normal term of life, that he becomes wealthier: manuṣyasyāmṛtatvaṃ yat sarvam āyur eti vasīyān bhavati*. J. Br. § 108 expresses the idea mentioned above: that also we men are able to become "*immortals*": *atha . . . te 'jāyanta (devāḥ); te sarva eva sāṅgāḥ satanavo 'mṛtāḥ samabhavan; sarvo haivo sāṅgaḥ satanur amṛtaḥ sambhavati, ya evaṃ veda*. So knowledge is the means that brought *devas* so far: so it will do us. J. Up. Br. 1,5,7: *sa yathoccbrāyam pratiyasya prapadyetaivam evaitayā devatayedam amṛtam abhiparyeti yatrāyam idaṃ taptīti* "as one would approach an elevation, toiling towards it, even thus by means of this divinity one compasses this immortality where this one here burns". So also P. Br. 1,6,5: where we learn that we can reach those qualities of "immortality" by knowledge; cf. P. Br. 1,18,10: where the sacred syllable *oṃ* and *sacrifice are the means* (P. Br. 1,22,8:).

2) The human beings can attain *deva*-hood like the *devas* themselves. P. Br. 17,14,2: *yadā saṃvatsarasya gṛhapatir bhavaty atha vaiśvadevasya mātrām āpnoti* "when he becomes the master of the house of the year (by the agnihotra) he reaches the measure of the *vaiśvadeva*". So P. Br. 18,2,10: teaches us that through the deity *soma* one comes to the deities: *devatayaiva devatā apyeti*[4]); cf. also J. Br. § 127 *ud vayaṃ tamasas pari suvaḥ paśyanto jyotir uttaraṃ devaṃ devatrā sūryam aganma jyotir uttamam ity etāṃ japann udaity*; and J. Up. Br. 3,26,5: *(tṛptir) taṃ devān abhipravahati*: "satisfaction

4. We came across a number of epithets only used a few times. P. Br. 1,2,9: "the Goddess i.e. prayer is beautiful and swift"; so P. Br. 1,3,5: praises Agni's brilliancy and Sūrya's splendour. Thus J. Up. Br. 4,11,1: praises six *devatās:* Agni, Vāyu, Sun, Breath, Food, and Speech as: selfexisting *svayambhū*. In J. Br. § 44 Agni receives the title of protector: *tam agniḥ suditaye chardir ity evābhyamṛśat.* The Aśvins are lauded because they release the convicts J. Br. § 176 *aśvinā u ha vai devānāṃ baddhamucau,* and they cure the sick: cf. J. Br. § 186 *aśvinau vai tau darvihomiṇau bhiṣajyantau.* So Varuṇa is praised as the great protector J. Up. Br. 4,1,2—6:.

The *devas* give wealth to us, P. Br. 1,7,6: (Agni) 14,6,4: (Indra) J. Up. Br. 1,55,4: (Prajāpati) *śriyaṃ vaḥ prayaccheyam:* "I shall bestow wealth upon you".

Some of the *devas* have a train of followers: that is: Indra having the Maruts following him everywhere; P. Br. 6,10,10: cf. also J. Br. § *149:*. The Maruts also belong to the subjects of the gods; cf. P. Br. 18,1,14:.

5. The number of the *devas.*

Several times one encounters the phrase that in the beginning Prajāpati was alone; cf. P. Br. 4,1,4: *Prajāpatir vā idam eka āsīt.*

Elsewhere we find the number of the *devas* mentioned as being 33: cf. P. Br. 4,4,11: 8,14: 6,2,5: 10,1,16: 22,7,4: 24,1,13: and often it is said that Prajāpati is the 34th *deva;* cf. P. Br. 17,11,3: 24,4,3:.

We also find a number of passages where Prajāpati is called seventeenfold; cf. P. Br. 4,5,6 . Elsewhere the *devas* are called "*many*", cf. J. Br. § 133 and somewhat unusual is J. Up. Br. 3,1,1: *ekā ha vāva kṛtsnā devatā 'rdhadevatā evā 'nyāḥ:* "there is one entire *devatā*, the other [illegible] med up as: sun, mo[illegible]

Con[illegible] above are as cons[illegible] superhuman nature as was the case in the sections of RV. and AV. Practically nowhere the quotations reveal to us a truly immeasurable force hiding in the *devas.* The epithets related above are merely an echo of the former periods. In themselves the *devas* are not less human nor more human than is indicated by the first adjectives mentioned on the first pages of this chapter.

6. Have the *devas* any divine qualities?

One may believe that *in the* somadraught the Indians saw the drink reserved for the *devas.* Also the Brāhmaṇas relate to us that Soma is king and also highly revered. It is mostly Indra who is mentioned as the drinker of *soma.* Cf. P. Br. 1,5,4: 5: 16: 6,1: 2:

14: 64: 108: J. Up. Br. 2,11,14; which we also often meet in the Brāhmaṇas S. Br. 4,3,89:.

b) by *tapas:* P. Br. 25,14,3: *atha yat tapas tapyate yā daivī tam tena,* "in that he gives himself over to asceticism, thereby he gets the welfare that is of the gods."

c) by the *sāman*: cf. P. Br. 15,5,30: "he attains power and greatness like Akūpara Kaśyapa" and in 16,14,4: "he conquers these worlds"; cf. P. Br. 24,12,4: 8: "he will thrive like the *devas*" and 24,17,2: 3: "he will acquire power and force". 25,11,3: "strongest one like Indra and Agni". There are several passages where *devas* and human beings are mentioned on the same level; cf. J. Br. § 47 *devāḥ pitaro manuṣyās te 'nyata āsann, asurā rakṣāṃsi piśācā anyatas; ta eṣu lokeṣv aspardhanta:* "*devas,* ancestors an men took their side, and *asuras, piśacas* and *rakṣasas* took theirs. And they fought a heavy battle in the Universe". And J. Br. § 86 *yad dha vā iha devebhyaḥ karoti, tad asmai devāḥ kurvanti.* Caland translating comments, "was er (d.h. der Verrichter des Opfers) hier (auf der Erde) für die Götter tut, das tun die Götter für ihn"; cf. also J. Br. § 92: 144: 200: 209: and also J. Up. Br. 1,3,2: 31,9: 4,1: 3,5,1:.

q) The relation between the *devas* is very often expressed in terms like father, child etc. So J. Br. § 144: *atho sarve vāva sma prājāpatyāḥ* and in P. Br. 1,5,6: *soma* is called "our father" *soma rārandhi no hṛdi pitā no'si mama tan mā māhiṃsiḥ.* However, this may be no more than a usual metaphorical expression which- surely does not point out a parental connexion among the *devas.*

The *devas* have children: *bṛhat* is like an eldest son to Prajāpati. P. Br. 7,6,6: 18,1,2: *devāśca va asurāśca prajāpatir dvayāḥ putrā āsan*; cf. also J. Up. Br. 3,30,3:. So Agni is born in rites P. Br. 14,2,3:.

The *devas* take their brides J. Br. § 35: *āpo vai devānāṃ patnaya āsan.* And they are thought to beget in human manner J. Br. § 35 *tā mithunam aicchanta.*

3. Now we may proceed to consider a series of epithets that certainly point to something more than human in *the concept of deva.* We hear of Varuṇa that he is powerful and vigorous cf. P. Br. 1,3,3: *tān Varuṇa apadhamat:* "Varuṇa just blew them away". Some passages speak of Indra's vigour *Indrasyendriyena* cf. P. Br. 1,3,5: 6,1: 8,1,5: 9,7,5: 8: 14,12,3: 24,17,2: 25,11,3: cf. also J. Up. Br. 1,28,2: 44,1:. So about Soma: P. Br. 1,5,4: 6,1: 6:.

4. We came across a number of epithets only used a few times. P. Br. 1,2,9: "the Goddess i.e. prayer is beautiful and swift"; so P. Br. 1,3,5: praises Agni's brilliancy and Sūrya's splendour. Thus J. Up. Br. 4,11,1: praises six *devatās*: Agni, Vāyu, Sun, Breath, Food, and Speech as: selfexisting *svayambhū*. In J. Br. § 44 Agni receives the title of protector: *tam agnih suditaye chardir ity evābhyamrjat*. The Aśvins are lauded because they release the convicts J. Br. § 176 *aśvinā u ha vai devānām baddhamucau*, and they cure the sick: cf. J. Br. § 186 *aśvinau vai tau darvihominau bhisajyantau*. So Varuṇa is praised as the great protector J. Up. Br. 4,1,2—6:.

The *devas* give wealth to us, P. Br. 1,7,6: (Agni) 14,6,4: (Indra) J. Up. Br. 1,55,4: (Prajāpati) *śriyam vaḥ prayaccheyam*: "I shall bestow wealth upon you".

Some of the *devas* have a train of followers: that is: Indra having the Maruts following him everywhere; P. Br. 6,10,10: cf. also J. Br. § 149:. The Maruts also belong to the subjects of the gods; cf. P. Br. 18,1,14:.

5. The number of the *devas*.

Several times one encounters the phrase that in the beginning Prajāpati was alone; cf. P. Br. 4,1,4: *Prajāpatir vā idam eka āsīt*.

Elsewhere we find the number of the *devas* mentioned as being 33: cf. P. Br. 4,4,11: 8,14: 6,2,5: 10,1,16: 22,7,4: 24,1,13: and often it is said that Prajāpati is the 34th *deva*; cf. P. Br. 17,11,3: 24,4,3:.

We also find a number of passages where Prajāpati is called seventeenfold; cf. P. Br. 4,5,6 . Elsewhere the *devas* are called "many", cf. J. Br. § 133 and somewhat unusual is J. Up. Br. 3,1,1: *ekā ha vāva kṛtsnā devatā 'rdhadevatā evā 'nyāh*: "there is one entire *devatā*, the others are half-*devatā*" and we find them summed up as: sun, moon, stars, fire, day and night, regions and the rain.

Concluding I cannot say that the epithets summed up above are as convincing of a superhuman nature as was the case in the sections of RV. and AV. Practically nowhere the quotations reveal to us a truly immeasurable force hiding in the *devas*. The epithets related above are merely an echo of the former periods. In themselves the *devas* are not less human nor more human than is indicated by the first adjectives mentioned on the first pages of this chapter.

6. Have the *devas* any divine qualities?

One may believe that in the somadraught the Indians saw the drink reserved for the *devas*. Also the Brāhmaṇas relate to us that Soma is king and also highly revered. It is mostly Indra who is mentioned as the drinker of *soma*. Cf. P. Br. 1,5,4: 5: 16: 6,1: 2:

14: 64: 108: J. Up. Br. 2,11,14; which we also often meet in the Brāhmaṇas S. Br. 4,3,89:.

b) by *tapas:* P. Br. 25,14,3: *atha yat tapas tapyate yā daivī taṃ tena,* "in that he gives himself over to asceticism, thereby he gets the welfare that is of the gods."

c) by the *sāman:* cf. P. Br. 15,5,30: "he attains power and greatness like Akūpara Kaśyapa" and in 16,14,4: "he conquers these worlds"; cf. P. Br. 24,12,4: 8: "he will thrive like the *devas*" and 24,17,2: 3: "he will acquire power and force". 25,11,3: "strongest one like Indra and Agni". There are several passages where *devas* and human beings are mentioned on the same level; cf. J. Br. § 47 *devāḥ pitaro manuṣyās te 'nyata āsann, asurā rakṣāṃsi piśācā anyatas; ta eṣu lokeṣv aspardhanta:* "*devas,* ancestors an men took their side, and *asuras, pisacas* and *rakṣasas* took theirs. And they fought a heavy battle in the Universe". And J. Br. § 86 *yad dha vā iha devebhyaḥ karoti, tad asmai devāḥ kurvanti.* Caland translating comments, "was er (d.h. der Verrichter des Opfers) hier (auf der Erde) für die Götter tut, das tun die Götter für ihn"; cf. also J. Br. § 92: 144: 200: 209: and also J. Up. Br. 1,3,2: 31,9: 4,1: 3,5,1:.

q) The relation between the *devas* is very often expressed in terms like father, child etc. So J. Br. § 144: *atho sarve vāva ima prājāpatyāḥ* and in P. Br. 1,5,6: *soma* is called "our father" *soma rārandhi no hṛdi pitā no'si mama tan mā mābhumṣiḥ.* However, this may be no more than a usual metaphorical expression which surely does not point out a parental connexion among the *devas.*

The *devas* have children: *bṛhat* is like an eldest son to Prajāpati. P. Br. 7,6,6: 18,1,2: *devāśca va asurāśca prajāpatur dvayāḥ putrā āsan;* cf. also J. Up. Br. 3,30,3:. So Agni is born in rites P. Br. 14,2,3:.

The *devas* take their brides *J. Br. § 35: āpo vai devānāṃ patnaya āsan.* And they are thought to beget in human manner J. Br. § 35 *tā mithunam aicchanta.*

3. Now we may proceed to consider a series of epithets that certainly point to something more than human in the concept of *deva.* We hear of Varuṇa that he is powerful and vigorous cf. P. Br. 1,3,3: *tān Varuṇa apadhamat:* "Varuṇa just blew them away". Some passages speak of Indra's vigour *Indrasyendriyena* cf. P. Br. 1,3,5: 6,1: 8,1,5: 9,7,5: 8: 14,12,3: 24,17,2: 25,11,3: cf. also J. Up. Br. 1,28,2: 44,1:. So about Soma: P. Br. 1,5,4: 6,1: 6:.

Brahman; cf. J. Up. Br. 3,38,1: *Prajāpatim brahmā 'sṛjata. tam apa-lyam amukham asṛjata.*

d) The *devas* ward off evil.

P. Br. 14,8,6: *pāpmānam aghnan*: "the gods had incited Indra, by means of the ninth they had repelled evil"; cf. P. Br. 15,2,7b.

I do not know whether *evil* has to be taken in a moral sense here or merely as ill-luck or physical misfortune.

e) The Brāhmaṇas sometimes make mention of the remission of sin. P. Br. 1,6,10: "*soma* is the annulment of guilt, gathered by the *devas*, by man and his ancestors": *enaso 'vayajanam asi*. P. Br. 14,11,28: presents Indra to us after having slain the *asuras* and feeling loaded with sin. The *devas* performed a sacrifice: "He thereby was freed of his bad lot".

It is also worth noticing that there is no talk about remorse and contrition in Indra. The *devas* are not the persons who forgive, but they take a hand in it by performing rites. Thus P. Br. 14,11,28: does not state that the *devas* forgave Indra, but that he became purified. Something similar we meet in J. Up. Br. 2,12,1: *yatro ha vai kvacaitā devatā nispṛśanti, na haiva tatra kaścana pāpmā nyaṅgaḥ pariśiṣyate*: "wheresoever these divinities touch, there no evil trace whatever will be left". Moreover J. Br. § 207 presents Rudra to us, asking why he has been created. And the answer is: *yo 'tipādayāt taṃ hanāsā iti*: "whosoever sins, you shall kill him (for punishment)".

f) Another quality of the *devas* is, that they live and ascend to heaven.

P. Br. 1,7,6: teaches that Agni goes to heaven where he meets the cheerful *devas*. The gods ascend to heaven with the help of a sacred chant cf. P. Br. 15,9,14: cf. also P. Br. 19,11,6: 20,11,3: or they reach heaven by a sacrifice P. Br. 16,12,1' or a sacred metre of the chants P. Br. 17,1,1:. So also J. Br. § 175 *ūrdhvān vā anye lokān devāś carṣayaś cājayan* and J. Up. Br. 3,19,2: *devā vā anayā trayyā (vidyayā) sarasayo 'rdhvās svargaṃ lokam udakrāman*. Again we may notice not by their own strength but by the Vedas; cf. also J. Up. Br. 4,13,10: *tenā 'pahatya mṛtyum apahatya pāpmānaṃ svargaṃ lokam āyan*. Sometimes we even read that the *devas* are living in the *sāman*: cf. J. Up. Br. 1,13,7: 14,1: or in the *anuṣṭubh*: J. Up. Br. 1,18,7.

g) The *devas* are "immortal (extremely vital)" or else gained this "vitality".

P. Br. 8,2,6: "The Atharvans forsooth desiring to reach the world, saw this *sāman*: they by means of it saw the world of immortality". The *devas* received this vitality from Prajāpati cf. P. Br. 22,12,1b:

18,5,2:. P. Br. 6,5,1: and J. Br. § 86: praises soma by: *annam aha vai devānāṃ somo rājā* "There king Soma is the nourishment of the devas".

b) The *devas* were thought to have power over life and death.

P. Br. 14,4,7: *tān etena sāmnā samairayat:* "and they revived them by means of this *sāman*". So P. Br. 14,6,10: narrates about the rejuvenating power of the Aśvins: *punar yuvānam akurutām*! But always by means of the *sāman*. The same power is mentioned, in J. Br. § 197: *tenainaṃ samairayat* and § 198 *taṃ samairayat; tad etad bheṣajam prāyaścittiḥ sāma*. J. Up. Br. 2,7,5: suggests some power in wealth and authority.

c) The *devas* created the universe.

Prajāpati is generally mentioned as the creator. He always desires to have someone for company as he feels lonely; cf. P. Br. 4,1,15:. So he longs for progeny and we learn that the Indians saw creation as an act of generation; cf. P. Br. 6,1,1: Prajāpati desired: "may I be more (than one), may I be reproduced. He saw that *agniṣṭoma and practised it; by it he created the creatures*". This certainly suggests that we may have to see the act of creating as a kind of sacrificial rite.

Elsewhere we come across a multitude of passages in which reference is made to Prajāpati's creating act. So we meet the expression that *Prajāpati created the creatures: Prajāpatiḥ . . . prajā asṛjata*; cf. P. Br. 6,1,1: 6: 8: 10: 11:[5]).

Prajāpati created the *devas* P. Br. 6,19,5:[6]) and the domestic animals P. Br. 8,5,6: etc. He is also the creator of the hymns and metres, of sacrifice and of man[7]). It is interesting to read in P. Br. 20,14,2: 7: *that Prajāpati being all alone by himself and being the* Universe, his first act of creation was emitting the Word: *Vāc;* and this word streamed through the entire Universe. According to P. Br. 20,16,1: Prajāpati apparently formed what is on this earth: *idaṃ vāva prathamenāhnā vyakarod yad idam asyām adhy āyattamūlam idam*. "On the first day he formed what here on this (earth) is firmly rooted: on the second day all living beings that move (on the earth and through the intermediate region): on the third day the rain that falls yonder, the stars and what belongs to yonder world." At first sight one could believe that there has been a slight influence from holy Writ, but P. Br. 20,16,2: takes all likelihood of that away. At times we read that the *devas* created the *vajra* cf. J. Br. § 26 and Rudra § 207.

In J. Up. Br. 3,2,11: Prajāpati is called *bhuvanasya gopā:* "the guardian of creation". But it seems that the Upaniṣad period was not contented with Prajāpati as the creator. His originator was

j) It seems that a class of gods, called *sādhyas*, has perished.

They were *devas*: cf. P. Br. 8,3,5: *sādhyā vai nāma devā āsan*; cf. also P. Br. 8,4,1: 9: and the same are explicitly mentioned in 25,8,2: *sādhyā vai nāma devebhyo devāḥ pūrva āsan*. We do not learn anything particular about them. Only the fact is mentioned. Yet, S. Br. 13,4,2,16: calls the *sādhyas* the guardians of a region; cf. also S. Br. 3,7,1,26.

7. I want to close this section on the Brāhmaṇas by giving a few details about some *devas* in particular.

1) We hear Indra called as usual: *Vṛṣabha*; cf. P. Br. 9,4,3: *Maghavant* P. Br. 9,10,1: J. Up. Br. 4,5,1:, and also in the same passage *vajrin deva*, *Vṛtrahan* and *ugra deva*. Numberless times we encounter these traits of Indra's character. His personality did not change much in this late part of the Vedic period. He is still the "mighty one".

2) Agni is the *dūta* or "messenger of the gods".

Cf. J. Br. § 136, but for the first time we hear that he is Prajāpati's eldest son cf. J. Up. Br. 1,51,5: and that he came forth from the mouth of Prajāpati cf. J. Br. § 9. Once he was Vāc (J. Up. Br. 2,2,1:). [illegible] if only we care for him (J. Up. Br. 2,14:). He is the *sāman* (J. Up. Br. 3,6,7:) and the *abhijit* (J. Up. Br. 3,20,1:) and so he is also called "world-conquering" *lokajit* and "food-eater" *annāda*. Elsewhere he is called "most voracious" J. Up. Br. 2,15:. He is the mouth of the *gāyatrī* (J. Up. Br. [illegible] Br. 4,11,5:). So he [illegible] cf. J. Up. Br. 2,14, [illegible] also in those days for Agni. J. Up. Br. 2,14: gives all these reasons for the worship of Agni. Who serves Agni well in this world, Agni will serve him in yonder world. One should not touch him with hand or feet nor with a stick: that means: do not wash yourself near a fire: do not stretch your feet towards a fire. Truly Agni makes such a person comfortable *sudhāyām hai 'vainam dadhāti*. Agni is always at the service of mankind here and hereafter. Then J. Up. Br. 4,11,5: 6: let Agni tell us: *aham asmy anyāsām prajānām mukham*. As he serves the *devas*, he also serves the human race.

3) Prajāpati really holds a special place in these Brāhmaṇas. Sometimes he gives the impression of being the Supreme Being. But this

(through a rite) cf. also P. Br. 23,12,2: 24,19,2: J. Up. Br. 1,11,8: says, that Prajāpati gave them the *udgītha*, therefore they are immortal. *Udgītham devebhyo 'mṛtam. tasmād te 'mṛtāḥ*; cf. also J. Br. § 108 — through sacrifice — and § 143: *ṛtena hi te tad amṛtam anvavindan*. Yet, here no reference is made to rites or chants but it is *ṛta*, the power that governs the universe, that renders supranormal vitality to the *devas*. J. Up. Br. 1,18,10: says that the *devas* reached "immortality" with the help of the sacred syllable *oṃ*.

h) Some of the *devas* are said to possess, or to have acquired supremacy over other *devas* or the Universe. So we meet Varuṇa, P. Br. 13,9,23: with the help of a *sāman* he attained paramountcy, P. Br. 15,3,30: by the *devasthāna*; cf. also J. Br. § 188.

Prajāpati is the supreme being and this is, as far as we are able to see, generally acknowledged throughout our sources; cf. P. Br. 16,4,1: 18,1,1: (implicitly in the context) 19,13,3: 22,18,4: and also J. Br. § 77: 161: 182: (implicitly in the context). Thus to Indra: P. Br. 16,4,3: 19,16,2: 22,8,2: 24,17,2: 25,1,9: 11,2: 3: cf. also J. Up. Br. 4,21,2: and J. Br. § 115: 139: 141:. J. Up. Br. 1,9,2: *oṃ itīndro vāg iti sarve devāḥ. tad etad indram eva sarve devā anuyanti*. A few times Agni is mentioned as the supreme Lord; cf. P. Br. 25,11,2: 3: J. Up. Br. 3,6,7: *sa iraiṣṭhyāyā 'dhipatyāyā 'nnādyāya purodhāyai jāyate*. But J. Br. brings the *devas* back to the position of creatures J. Br. § 168 *eṣā ha vai devānāṃ rājñī yac chraddhā; saiṣā prātar upakramya tiṣṭhati; tāṃ devā upatiṣṭhante: yadricy eṣyati tadryañca eṣyāma iti; tasyai sarve devā anuvartmānaḥ sāyaṃ juṣante; tām āviśati sa juhoti, sa yajate; tad devā upajīvanti*. "Die gläubige Gesinnung soll nicht von euch weichen. Die gläubige Gesinnung ist die Herrscherin der Götter. Morgens früh kommt sie heran: die Götter stellen sich ehrerbietig vor sie, denkend: "Nach welcher Richtung gewandt sie kommen wird, dahin gerichtet werden wir gehen. Ihr dienend geniessen abends alle Götter. In diese tritt er ein, er giesst Spenden aus, er bringt Verehrung dar· davon leben die Götter" (Caland, p. 227).

i) These *devas* are offered to.

P. Br. 1,6,4: *iṣṭayajuṣas te deva soma, stutastomasya*: "O divine *soma* to whom formulas and chants have been offered". So P. Br. 15,5,9: where Agni is praised: *Agniṃ vai pūrvair ahabhir ājuhoty* and J. Br. § 6 says: *suhutaṃ devān rādhayānīti ha pratalanṣa*. The *devas* love the praises and offerings offered to them. Moreover sacrifice is a strengthening power for the *devas*; cf. J. Up. Br. 1,9,3: *etena* (the syllable *oṃ*) *vai saṃsave parasya 'ndraṃ vṛñjita*: "by it and a simultaneous soma-offering one could force Indra away from his rival".

5) It seems that a class of gods, called *sādhyas*, has perished.

They were *devas*: cf. P. Br. 8,3,5: *sādhyā vai nāma devā āsan*; cf. also P. Br. 8,4,1: 9: and the same are explicitly mentioned in 25,8,2: *sādhyā vai nāma devebhyo devāḥ pūrva āsan*. We do not learn anything particular about them. Only the fact is mentioned. Yet, S. Br. 13,4,2,16: calls the *sādhyas* the guardians of a region; cf. also S. Br. 3,7,1,26.

7. I want to close this section on the Brāhmaṇas by giving a few details about some *devas* in particular.

1) We hear Indra called as usual: *Vṛṣabha*; cf. P. Br. 9,4,3: *Maghavant* P. Br. 9,10,1: J. Up. Br. 4,5,1:, and also in the same passage *vajrin deva*, *Vṛtrahan* and *ugra deva*. Numberless times we encounter these traits of Indra's character. His personality did not change much in this late part of the Vedic period. He is still the "mighty one".

2) Agni is the *dūta* or "messenger of the gods".

Cf. J. Br. § 136, but for the first time we hear that he is Prajāpati's eldest son cf. J. Up. Br. 1,51,5: and that he came forth from the mouth of Prajāpati cf. J. Br. § 9. Once he was *Vāc* (J. Up. Br. 2,2,1:). He is identified with Rudra (P. Br. 12,4,24:) and with Mṛtyu (J. Br. § 5: 112·). He receives the praise of the *prastāva* (J. Up. Br. 1,33,5:) and is lauded as being the *vatsa* of the Brahmins (J. Up. Br. 2,13,1:). Yet we glorify him because he looks after every one of us, if only we care for him (J. Up. Br. 2,14:). He is the *sāman* (J. Up. Br. 3,6,7:) and the *abhijit* (J. Up. Br. 3,20,1:) and so he is also called "world-conquering" *lokajit* and "food-eater" *annāda*. Elsewhere he is called "most voracious" J. Up. Br. 2,15:. He is the mouth of the *gāyatrī* (J. Up. Br. 4,8,2) and elsewhere *devānām mukham* (J. Up. Br. 4,11,5:). So he kept too his old capacity of "serving mankind" cf. J. Up. Br. 2,14,1: 2 . Here we discover the high esteem one had also in those days for Agni. J. Up. Br. 2,14: gives all these reasons for the worship of Agni. Who serves Agni well in this world, Agni will serve him in yonder world. One should not touch him with hand or feet nor with a stick that means: do not wash yourself near a fire: do not stretch your feet towards a fire. Truly Agni makes such a person comfortable *sudhāyāṃ hai 'vainaṃ dadhāti*. Agni is always at the service of mankind here and hereafter. Then J. Up. Br. 4,11,5: 6: let Agni tell us: *aham asmy anyāsām prajānām mukham*. As he serves the *devas*, he also serves the human race.

3) Prajāpati really holds a special place in these Brāhmaṇas. Sometimes he gives the impression of being the Supreme Being. But this

(through a rite) cf. also P. Br. 23,12,2: 24,19,2: J. Up. Br. 1,11,8: says, that Prajāpati gave them the *udgītha*, therefore they are immortal. *Udgītham devebhyo 'mṛtam. tasmād te 'mṛtāḥ*; cf. also J. Br. § 108 — through sacrifice — and § 143: *ṛtena hi te tad amṛtam anvavindan*. Yet, here no reference is made to rites or chants but it is *ṛta*, the power that governs the universe, that renders supranormal vitality to the *devas*. J. Up. Br. 1,18,10: says that the *devas* reached "immortality" with the help of the sacred syllable *oṃ*.

h) Some of the *devas* are said to possess, or to have acquired supremacy over other *devas* or the Universe. So we meet Varuṇa, P. Br. 13,9,23: with the help of a *sāman* he attained paramountcy, P. Br. 15,3,30: by the *devasthāna*; cf. also J. Br. § 188.

Prajāpati is the supreme being and this is, as far as we are able to see, generally acknowledged throughout our sources; cf. P. Br. 16,4,1: 18,1,1: (implicitly in the context) 19,13,3: 22,18,4: and also J. Br. § 77: 161: 182: (implicitly in the context). Thus to Indra: P. Br. 16,4,3: 19,16,2: 22,8,2: 24,17,2: 25,1,9: 11,2: 3: cf. also J. Up. Br. 4,21,2: and J. Br. § 115: 139: 141:. J. Up. Br. 1,9,2: *oṃ itīndro vāg iti sarve devāḥ. tad etad indram eva sarve devā anuyanti*. A few times Agni is mentioned as the supreme Lord; cf. P. Br. 25,11,2: 3: J. Up. Br. 3,6,7: *sa śraiṣṭhyāyā 'dhipatyāyā 'nnādyāya purodhāyai jāyate*. But J. Br. brings the *devas* back to the position of creatures J. Br. § 168 *eṣā ha vai devānāṃ rājñī yac chraddhā; saiṣā prātar upakramya tiṣṭhati; tāṃ devā upatiṣṭhante: yadricy eṣyati tadryañca eṣyāma iti; tasyai sarve devā anuvartmānaḥ sāyaṃ juṣante; tām āviśati sa juhoti, sa yajate; tad devā upajīvanti*. "Die gläubige Gesinnung soll nicht von euch weichen. Die gläubige Gesinnung ist die Herrscherin der Götter. Morgens früh kommt sie heran: die Götter stellen sich ehrerbietig vor sie, denkend: "Nach welcher Richtung gewandt sie kommen wird, dahin gerichtet werden wir gehen. Ihr dienend geniessen abends alle Götter. In diese tritt er ein, er giesst Spenden aus, er bringt Verehrung dar· davon leben die Götter" (Caland, p. 227).

i) These *devas* are offered to.

P. Br. 1,6,4: *iṣṭayajuṣas te deva soma, stutastomasya*: "O divine *soma* to whom formulas and chants have been offered". So P. Br. 15,5,9: where Agni is praised: *Agniṃ vai pūrvair ahabhir ājuhoty* and J. Br. § 6 says: *suhutaṃ devān rādhayānīti ha praśaṃsa*. The *devas* love the praises and offerings offered to them. Moreover sacrifice is a strengthening power for the *devas*; cf. J. Up. Br. 1,9,3: *etena* (the syllable *oṃ*) *vai saṃsave paraspe 'ndraṃ vṛñjita*: "by it and a simultaneous soma-offering one could force Indra away from his rival".

entirely foreign to the Indian mind. This as far as my own experience goes meeting people on my daily travels. But some signs of this disappreciation can be traced even in the Indian Literature. J. Masson [8]) in his dissertation gives us some insight into the popular belief in *deva*-hood in early Buddhist times. Also as Buddhists they still believe in the existence of the devas (o.c. p. 12): "Le monde entier proclame bien haut qu'il y a des dieux" and afterwards on the same page the author says: "Those devas are neither omnipotent nor eternal nor even immutable. They are subject like other beings to transmigration" and p. 14: "Renaître dieu n'est donc qu'un pis-aller temporaire, offert à qui ne sait pas mieux". This shows the meaning of *deva* at that time. On p. 15 he continues: "L'ignorance des dieux, même les plus grands, va de pair avec leur impermanence; et les textes bouddhiques ne manquent pas de signaler cette autre déficience de leur perfection bienheureuse", and he continues: "Les dieux eux-mêmes sentent bien leur infériorité vis-à-vis du Bouddha, des Bouddhistes et du Bouddhisme". Sakka (or Indra) is the most popular deva, and he is looked upon as the chief of the 33 devas (tāvatiṃsa). Also to the Bouddhists he is: "le furieux dieu du tonnerre et des batailles" (o.c. p. 46).

One meets two types of Sakka: "le type plus ancien, de l'Indra, souverain-batailleur; le type, plus récent et un peu pâle du Sakka généreux". But this very Sakka worshipped by the Buddhists as well d... not feel himself too supreme and too divine: "Alors vint au ... qui lui demanda comment, en bref, un moine ... [illegible] ...uit en effet brièvement, puis ... ther: "Hommage de Sakka ... :evant un simple disciple du Bienheureux" (o.c. p. [illegible])

Something similar we come across in Ch. Up. 8,9,2: etc. where Indra with the *devas* comes to Prajāpati to become instructed. "Sakka still rules over the *Tāvatiṃsa devaloka* the lowest heaven but one, of the lower plane" cf. Malasekhara: Dictionary of Pāli proper names. London, 1938, p. 958: "He is more or less the primus inter pares, yet he surpasses his companions in ten things".

But even the qualities that could in themselves suggest something strictly divine, now only hint at just a bit more than human qualities: such as creation, forgiveness of sin, or supremacy is only acquired by the mere power of rites, sacrifices and chants.

The readiness to help ascribed to them, their protection etc. are all nearly forgotten. The *devas* are not any more the centre of pious thought but far more: Sacrifice and its parts. To these the *devas* lost their importance and the *devas* are really employed to prove the importance of those rites.

position, acquired in the Brāhmaṇa period, Prajāpati loses entirely in the Upaniṣads, although even there he is sometimes mentioned in his exalted place. We may summarize: Prajāpati distributes food and vigour to the gods P. Br. 6,4,1:; he governs and helps the *devas*, who always resort to him for help. P. Br. 8,3,1: 12,13,4: 5: 27: 13,4,1: 19,19,1: 22,17,2: and also 18,1,4: cf. also J. Br. § 73: J. Up. Br. 1, 15, 2: 16,9: 49,1:. He possesses supremacy P. Br. 19,13,3: 22,18,4:.

Prajāpati has the right of casting a vote: *tau prajāpatav aprcchetām* cf. J. Br. § 17: 34: § 49: 182:. Prajāpati supports his creatures (J. Br. § 59) *evam ha vā eṣa prajāpatiḥ saṃvatsaraḥ prajān bibharti;* cf. J. Up. Br. 1,11,3—8: Prajāpati feeds the animals, birds and *devas*, and in 1,12,1: etc. we hear the same mentioned of Gandharvas, Apsarases, the ancestors etc.; J. Br. § 8: even states that in the beginning Prajāpati was this (universe) *Prajāpatir vāvedam agra āsīt*, and this passage continues: *mano ha vai prajāpatir devatā*. Which Caland renders: "Die Gottheit Prajāpati ist ja der Geist". But continuing our reading we discover that Prajāpati created his creatures from his arm, breast, etc.

Conclusions.

Concluding our research on the concept of *deva* in the Brāhmaṇas we first of all see that the number of purely human epithets does not decrease, but increases. The suggestion of being thoroughly human becomes stronger and stronger. In RV. and AV. the *devas* perform the great deeds themselves. They have an immense power in their own beings, to kill and to revive. The Brāhmaṇas present the *devas* to us with less exalted and less august epithets. The great deeds they perform, are done practically, without any exception, by a certain magic knowledge of how to handle mighty powers. Or by a vision that comes from somewhere, wherein they see the rites and hymns and chants with which they will be able to act. Not the *devas* but the rites are the powerful ones, and I want to stress this "human" side of the *devas* as the Brāhmaṇas always clearly state that anyone "who knows this" or "who uses this rite" is able to do exactly the same and with the same results as the *devas*.

Concerning their "morals" we do not like to conclude that the *devas* are so august and sublime. They are far less lofty than we have known them to be in the earlier parts of this Vedic age. And even their chiefs such as Prajāpati committed sins that are regarded as very serious in the minds of the Indians: incest and murder. Nowadays the Indian tries to rationalize this old and low opinion of the *devas* by giving a mystical explanation and stating that Westerners cannot understand those topics and sometimes I heard also the reproach that we, Westerners, were the inventors of the bad sense, which was

entirely foreign to the Indian mind. This as far as my own experience goes meeting people on my daily travels. But some signs of this disappreciation can be traced even in the Indian Literature. J. Masson [3]) in his dissertation gives us some insight into the popular belief in *deva*-hood in early Buddhist times. Also as Buddhists they still believe in the existence of the devas (o.c. p. 12): "Le monde entier proclame bien haut qu'il y a des dieux" and afterwards on the same page the author says: "Those devas are neither omnipotent nor eternal nor even immutable. They are subject like other beings to transmigration" and p. 14: "Renaître dieu n'est donc qu'un pis-aller temporaire, offert à qui ne sait pas mieux". This shows the meaning of *deva* at that time. On p. 15 he continues: "L'ignorance des dieux, même les plus grands, va de pair avec leur impermanence; et les textes bouddhiques ne manquent pas de signaler cette autre déficience de leur perfection bienheureuse", and he continues: "Les dieux eux-mêmes sentent bien leur infériorité vis-à-vis du Bouddha, des Bouddhistes et du Bouddhisme". Sakka (or Indra) is the most popular deva, and he is looked upon as the chief of the 33 devas (tāvatiṃsa). Also to the Bouddhists he is: "le furieux dieu du tonnerre et des batailles" (o.c. p. 46).

One meets two types of Sakka: "le type plus ancien, de l'Indra, souverain-batailleur; le type, plus récent et un peu pâle du Sakka généreux". But this very Sakka worshipped by the Buddhists as well does not feel himself too supreme and too divine: "Alors vint au Bouddha le dieu Sakka, qui lui demanda comment, en bref, un moine peut devenir délivré. Et le Bouddha l'instruit en effet brièvement, puis le dieu remonte aux cieux" and a bit further: "Hommage de Sakka au Bouddha, faiblesses du dieu même devant un simple disciple du Bienheureux" (o.c. p. 48).

Something similar we come across in Ch. Up. 8,9,2: etc. where Indra with the *devas* comes to Prajāpati to become instructed. "Sakka still rules over the *Tāvatiṃsa devaloka* the lowest heaven but one, of the lower plane" cf. Malasekhara: Dictionary of Pāli proper names. London, 1938, p. 958: "He is more or less the primus inter pares, yet he surpasses his companions in ten things".

But even the qualities that could in themselves suggest something strictly divine, now only hint at just a bit more than human qualities: such as creation, forgiveness of sin, or supremacy is only acquired by the mere power of rites, sacrifices and chants.

The readiness to help ascribed to them, their protection etc. are all nearly forgotten. The *devas* are not any more the centre of pious thought but far more: Sacrifice and its parts. To these the *devas* lost their importance and the *devas* are really employed to prove the importance of those rites.

position, acquired in the Brāhmaṇa period, Prajāpati loses entirely in the Upaniṣads, although even there he is sometimes mentioned in his exalted place. We may summarize: Prajāpati distributes food and vigour to the gods P. Br. 6,4,1:; he governs and helps the *devas*, who always resort to him for help. P. Br. 8,3,1: 12,13,4: 5: 27: 13,4,1: 19,19,1: 22,17,2: and also 18,1,4: cf. also J. Br. § 73: J. Up. Br. 1, 15, 2: 16,9: 49,1:. He possesses supremacy P. Br. 19,13,3: 22,18,4:.

Prajāpati has the right of casting a vote: *tau prajāpatav apṛcchetām* cf. J. Br. § 17: 34: § 49: 182:. Prajāpati supports his creatures (J. Br. § 59) *evam ha vā eṣa prajāpatiḥ saṃvatsaraḥ prajān bibharti*; cf. J. Up. Br. 1,11,3—8: Prajāpati feeds the animals, birds and *devas*, and in 1,12,1: etc. we hear the same mentioned of Gandharvas, Apsarases, the ancestors etc.; J. Br. § 8: even states that in the beginning Prajāpati was this (universe) *Prajāpatir vāvedam agra āsīt*, and this passage continues: *mano ha vai prajāpatir devatā*. Which Caland renders: "Die Gottheit Prajāpati ist ja der Geist". But continuing our reading we discover that Prajāpati created his creatures from his arm, breast, etc.

Conclusions.

Concluding our research on the concept of *deva* in the Brāhmaṇas we first of all see that the number of purely human epithets does not decrease, but increases. The suggestion of being thoroughly human becomes stronger and stronger. In RV. and AV. the *devas* perform the great deeds themselves. They have an immense power in their own beings, to kill and to revive. The Brāhmaṇas present the *devas* to us with less exalted and less august epithets. The great deeds they perform, are done practically, without any exception, by a certain magic knowledge of how to handle mighty powers. Or by a vision that comes from somewhere, wherein they see the rites and hymns and chants with which they will be able to act. Not the *devas* but the rites are the powerful ones, and I want to stress this "human" side of the *devas* as the Brāhmaṇas always clearly state that anyone "who knows this" or "who uses this rite" is able to do exactly the same and with the same results as the *devas*.

Concerning their "morals" we do not like to conclude that the *devas* are so august and sublime. They are far less lofty than we have known them to be in the earlier parts of this Vedic age. And even their chiefs such as Prajāpati committed sins that are regarded as very serious in the minds of the Indians: incest and murder. Nowadays the Indian tries to rationalize this old and low opinion of the *devas* by giving a mystical explanation and stating that Westerners cannot understand those topics and sometimes I heard also the reproach that we, Westerners, were the inventors of the bad sense, which was

weakness but does not prove foolishness. Where the author states (o.c. p. 177): "all is now symbolical and the gods, though in general *they* are the gods of RV., are not the same as of old. The priests have become gods. The old appellation of "spirit" asura is confined to evil spirits", I only can agree as long as "gods" means superhuman and powerful beings, in any higher and especially moral meaning, I do not agree.

In the introduction to the Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa the same author [8]) says: "More interesting is the relation between the gods and demons. The chief difference between these is that the demons represent darkness and the gods light, the demons evil, the gods good." As a whole we may agree, but this difference is not everywhere discernable. More often we receive the impression that they are just each others' opponents and as Hopkins states o.c. p. 37: "There is some historical feeling in the statement that the gods were younger [illegible] children of the creator; historically

[illegible]

the help of the father-god cf. P. Br. 8,3,1:." I am at a loss to understand why he translates here *devas* with "gods" and *asuras* with "demons". Sometimes a reader might conclude that the *devas* are truly nasty towards the *asuras* and that they are always out to rob and hurt them. Farquhar in his Outline Religious Lit., p. 31 f. comes to the conclusion: "The priests and the sacrifice were now supreme and omnipotent, and in consequence the religion had become pitifully degraded. The sacrifice was conceived as a magic system, irresistibly wielding all powers in earth and heaven and the priests who held the system in their hands were regarded as gods on earth. Hence, though the gods nominally retain their old place, they have become of very little account, stripped of nearly all their real power by priests and sacrifice."

It is true, but where we read about sacrifice and rites and chants, we do not hear much of priests and priesthood. There is one exception when Bṛhaspati is said to strive earnestly for the task of *purohita*, and where we read that some *devas* take up the duty of an *udgātar*. In my research I did not come across the *deva*-hood of the Brahmins. Yet, elsewhere, e.g. in the Mahābhārata we notice the other opinion when Jaratkāru answers his wife: "the sun would not set if I had not performed the saṃdhyā rite".

Oldenberg [9]) concludes his introduction in the same way: "Das priesterliche Selbstbewusstsein aber, das aus den Brāhmaṇatexten spricht, lebt es nicht in unterwürfiger Demut aus der Hand eines Höheren zu empfangen" (p. 14) and on the next page he continues: "Da kann denn den Indra und Varuṇa nur der Schatten ihrer einstigen

Opinions of the Authorities.

In his Indian Mythology A. A. Macdonell concludes, that the *devas* are conceived in this Brāhmaṇa epoch as having more universal power than in the Vedic period; o.c. p. 73. To my regret I cannot agree. If the author wanted to state that only a few *devas* are mentioned by name and that these few are acting all the time, I agree. But their universal power is not so much their own power as well the powers *concealed in the magic rites and chants of the sacrifices.* About Prajāpati the same author says: "that he is a creation not so much of popular mythology as of priestly speculation and the result of this fact — as was inevitable — was that his permanence as a great god was not assured".

It may be that the Brahmins could not find enough material in their own minds to equip this image of Prajāpati with. Because of *his name only he could have grown to the highest and supreme* being if only they had had a clear conception of the idea concerned, viz. the creator. In this case they might have succeeded.

Macdonell too, sees the change of attitude between *devas* and *asuras.* If those terms were before epithets of the same group of beings, *now they have separated and turned each other's enemies.* Nevertheless one does not receive a clear notion from him of the *devas* nor of the *asuras, nor of the important problem of the historical* or religious background of the struggle between *devas* and *asuras.* He states: "In the phenomenon coupled with the fact that the Iranians treated *daeva* — the word corresponding to the Vedic *deva* "god" — as meaning "devil", it is natural to see a result of hostile relations between the Iranian reformed faith of Zoroaster and the older Vedic belief". However, I believe that another question remains to be solved: namely whether in these early ages there was such an intense cultural interchange between Iran and India, and *why the same happened in India as in Iran but with entirely different* outcome.

E. W. Hopkins in Religion of India, p. 267, says: "The gods of old are accepted by the orthodox as a matter of course, although theoretically they are born of the All god, who is without the need of ceremonial rites". I should like to express a doubt: the *devas* are said to be born from Prajāpati- but he needs offerings and rites and even *tapas* to perform his great deeds. Why does the author use the word: "all god" and what does he suggest that it might mean?

O.c. p. 195: "The tales of gods *for the most part are foolish.* But they show well what conception the priests had of their divinities". I for one am doubtful about the term "*foolish*". The *devas* might often be in great need of help from "on high". That shows

weakness but does not prove foolishness. Where the author states (o.c. p. 177): "all is now symbolical and the gods, though in general [illegible]

[illegible]

not agree.

In the introduction to the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa the same author [9]) says: "More interesting is the relation between the gods and demons. The chief difference between these is that the demons represent darkness and the gods light, the demons evil, the gods good." As a whole we may agree, but this difference is not everywhere discernable. More often we receive the impression that they are just each others' opponents and as Hopkins states o.c. p. 37: "There is some historical feeling in the statement that the gods were younger brothers of the demons (both being children of the creator: historically a damaging addition) and that the demons were stronger, did sometimes prevail and would often have prevailed, had it not been for the help of the father-god cf. P. Br. 8,3,1:." I am at a loss to understand why he translates here *devas* with "gods" and *asuras* with "demons". Sometimes a reader might conclude that the *devas* are truly nasty towards the *asuras* and that they are always out to rob and hurt them. Farquhar in his Outline Religious Lit., p. 31 f. comes to the conclusion: "The priests and the sacrifice were now supreme and omnipotent, and in consequence the religion had become pitifully degraded. The sacrifice was conceived as a magic system, irresistibly wielding all powers in earth and heaven and the priests who held the system in their hands were regarded as gods on earth. Hence, though the gods nominally retain their old place, they have become of very little account, stripped of nearly all their real power by priests and sacrifice."

It is true, but where we read about sacrifice and rites and chants, we do not hear much of priests and priesthood. There is one exception when Bṛhaspati is said to strive earnestly for the task of *purohita*, and where we read that some *devas* take up the duty of an *udgātar*. In my research I did [illegible] elsew[illegible] Jarat[illegible] would not set if I had not performed the saṃdhyā rite".

Oldenberg [10]) concludes his introduction in the same way: "Das priesterliche Selbstbewusstsein aber, das aus den Brāhmanatexten spricht, hebt es nicht in unterwürfiger Demut aus der Hand eines Höheren zu empfangen" (p. 14) and on the next page he continues: "Da kann denn den Indra und Varuṇa nur der Schatten ihrer einstigen

Opinions of the Authorities.

In his Indian Mythology A. A. Macdonell concludes, that the *devas* are conceived in this Brāhmaṇa epoch as having more universal power than in the Vedic period; o.c. p. 73. To my regret I cannot agree. If the author wanted to state that only a few *devas* are mentioned by name and that these few are acting all the time, I agree. But their universal power is not so much their own power as well the powers concealed in the magic rites and chants of the sacrifices. About Prajāpati the same author says: "that he is a creation not so much of popular mythology as of priestly speculation and the result of this fact — as was inevitable — was that his permanence as a great god *was not assured*".

It may be that the Brahmins could not find enough material in their own minds to equip this image of Prajāpati with. Because of his name only he could have grown to the highest and supreme being if only they had had a clear conception of the idea concerned, viz. the creator. In this case they might have succeeded.

Macdonell too, sees the change of attitude between *devas* and *asuras*. If those terms were before epithets of the same group of beings, now they have separated and turned each other's enemies. Nevertheless one does not receive a clear notion from him of the *devas* nor of the *asuras*, nor of the important problem of the historical or religious background of the struggle between *devas* and *asuras*. He states: "In the phenomenon coupled with the fact that the Iranians treated *daeva* — the word corresponding to the Vedic *deva* "god" — as meaning "devil", it is natural to see a result of hostile relations between the Iranian reformed faith of Zoroaster and the older Vedic belief". However, I believe that another question remains to be solved: namely whether in these early ages there was such an intense cultural interchange between Iran and India, and why the same happened in India as in Iran but with entirely different outcome.

E. W. Hopkins in Religion of India, p. 267, says: "The gods of old are accepted by the orthodox as a matter of course, although theoretically they are born of the All god, who is without the need of ceremonial rites". I should like to express a doubt: the *devas* are said to be born from Prajāpati: but he needs offerings and rites and even *tapas* to perform his great deeds. Why does the author use the word: "all god" and what does he suggest that it might mean?

O.c. p. 195: "The tales of gods for the most part are foolish. But they show well what conception the priests had of their divinities". I for one am doubtful about the term: "foolish". The *devas* might often be in great need of help from "on high". That shows

weakness but does not prove foolishness. Where the author states (o.c. p. 177): "all is now symbolical and the gods, though in general they are the gods of RV., are not the same as of old. The priests have become gods. The old appellation of "spirit" asura is confined to evil spirits", I only can agree as long as "gods" means superhuman and powerful beings, in any higher and especially moral meaning, I do not agree.

In the introduction to the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa the same author [8]) says: "More interesting is the relation between the gods and demons. The chief difference between these is that the demons represent darkness and the gods light, the demons evil, the gods good." As a whole we may agree, but this difference is not everywhere discernable. More often we receive the impression that they are just each others' opponents and as Hopkins states o.c. p. 37: "There is some historical feeling in the statement that the gods were younger brothers of the demons (both being children of the creator: historically a damaging addition) and that the demons were stronger, did sometimes prevail and would often have prevailed, had it not been for the help of the father-god cf. P. Br. 8,3,1:." I am at a loss to understand why he translates here *devas* with "gods" and *asuras* with "demons". Sometimes a reader might conclude that the *devas* are truly nasty towards the *asuras* and that they are always out to rob and hurt them. Farquhar in his Outline Religious Lit., p. 31 f. comes to the conclusion: "The priests and the sacrifice were now supreme and omnipotent, and in consequence the religion had become pitifully degraded. The sacrifice was conceived as a magic system, irresistibly wielding all powers in earth and heaven and the priests who held the system in their hands were regarded as gods on earth. Hence, though the gods nominally retain their old place, they have become of very little account, stripped of nearly all their real power by priests and sacrifice."

It is true, but where we read about sacrifice and rites and chants, we do not hear much of priests and priesthood. There is one exception when Bṛhaspati is said to strive earnestly for the task of *purohita*, and where we read that some *devas* take up the duty of an *udgātar*. In my research I did not come across the *deva*-hood of the Brahmins. Yet, elsewhere, e.g. in the Mahābhārata we notice the other opinion when Jaratkaru answers his wife: "the sun would not set if I had not performed the saṃdhyā rite".

Oldenberg [34]) concludes his introduction in the same way: "Das priesterliche Selbstbewusstsein aber, das aus den Brāhmaṇatexten spricht, liebt es nicht in unterwürfiger Demut aus der Hand eines Herren zu empfangen" (p. 14) and on the next page he continues: "Da kann denn den Indra und Varuṇa nur der Schatten ihres einstigen

Opinions of the Authorities.

In his Indian Mythology A. A. Macdonell concludes, that the *devas* are conceived in this Brāhmaṇa epoch as having more universal power than in the Vedic period; o.c. p. 73. To my regret I cannot agree. If the author wanted to state that only a few *devas* are mentioned by name and that these few are acting all the time, I agree. But their universal power is not so much their own power as well the powers concealed in the magic rites and chants of the sacrifices. About Prajāpati the same author says: "that he is a creation not so much of popular mythology as of priestly speculation and the result of this fact — as was inevitable — was that his permanence as a great god was not assured".

It may be that the Brahmins could not find enough material in their own minds to equip this image of Prajāpati with. Because of his name only he could have grown to the highest and supreme being if only they had had a clear conception of the idea concerned, viz. the creator. In this case they might have succeeded.

Macdonell too, sees the change of attitude between *devas* and *asuras*. If those terms were before epithets of the same group of beings, now they have separated and turned each other's enemies. Nevertheless one does not receive a clear notion from him of the *devas* nor of the *asuras*, nor of the important problem of the historical or religious background of the struggle between *devas* and *asuras*. He states: "In the phenomenon coupled with the fact that the Iranians treated *daeva* — the word corresponding to the Vedic *deva* "god" — as meaning "devil", it is natural to see a result of hostile relations between the Iranian reformed faith of Zoroaster and the older Vedic belief". However, I believe that another question remains to be solved: namely whether in these early ages there was such an intense cultural interchange between Iran and India, and why the same happened in India as in Iran but with entirely different outcome.

E. W. Hopkins in Religion of India, p. 267, says: "The gods of old are accepted by the orthodox as a matter of course, although theoretically they are born of the All god, who is without the need of ceremonial rites". I should like to express a doubt: the *devas* are said to be born from Prajāpati: but he needs offerings and rites and even *tapas* to perform his great deeds. Why does the author use the word: "all god" and what does he suggest that it might mean?

O.c. p. 195: "The tales of gods for the most part are foolish. But they show well what conception the priests had of their divinities". I for one am doubtful about the term: "foolish". The *devas* might often be in great need of help from "on high". That shows

EXAMINATION OF THE CHANDOGYA AND BRHAD-ARANYAKA UPANISHADS

Coming to the last part of our research we must begin by stating the fact that the term *devas* does not occur as often as is expected. Though it might be partly dependent *on the nature* of these books, one really is under the impression that the *devas* are in decline in the respect and cultus of the faithful. Moreover this very respect, *mixed with* fear, is fading away. In this "free thinker's research" as the Upaniṣads are, there is practically no mentioning of cultus of the *devas*, except a little bit hidden away in the term: upāsse "you meditate upon" e.g. Ch. Up. 4,2,2:.

1. To begin with it seems that the younger Vedic times saw or liked to see Prajāpati as the father or origin of the *devas* and *asuras* cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,1: and BAU. 1,3,1: 5,2,1: 5,1:. So in BAU. 1,3,1: the *devas* are called *kānīyasāḥ*: "the younger brothers", and the *asuras* the *jyāyasāḥ*, "the elder ones". So here we discover a tendency to standardize *Asura* and *Deva* as brothers, yet everywhere it is said that there is a feud between them. Prajāpati is often called *pitar* cf. Ch. Up. 5,1,7: and even his name points in that same direction: "Lord of offspring", though in this text no *devas* or *asuras* call him father, but the *prajas*. But the very same Prajāpati seems to be raised to the rank of Highest Being in BAU. 1,5,20: *yathaiṣā devatā, evaṃ saḥ yathaitāṃ devatāṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny avanti, evaṃ haivaṃvidaṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny avanti*[1]). Senart translates: "Telle est cette divinité (Prajāpati) tel il est. Comme tous les êtres servent cette divinité, tous servent celui qui sait ainsi." We find another hint of Prajāpati's highest place among the *devas* in BAU. 4,3,33: where the *Prajapati-loka* ranks among the highest "heavens" except that of *brahma*. Here we already notice that Prajāpati is slowly put aside by the concept of Brahman, as Brahman's *loka* is said to be equal to a hundred times the happiness of Prajāpati's world.

But in BAU. 5,5,1: we are taught that the beginning and origin of everything were "the waters": *āpa evedam agra āsuḥ*. And out of these waters "developed" (asṛjanta) the *satyam*: "reality or truth" and *satyam* let evolve *brahman* from itself. And out of brahman

Grösze bleiben. Auch in Indien sind es die Priester, die den Göttern die Lebenskraft verkümmert haben".

Or is it possible that the concept of *deva* contained far less than we like to admit, so that the poor content could not satisfy the educated priests anymore or the unsophisticated people? Just this gradual degradation in value of the *deva* concept makes me doubtful that *deva* should have been the Indian concept of God in the strict sense. I believe, this implicitly points out that the Indian mind, also of this age, might have had a feeling for something higher. A number of passages do so implicitly and some other texts do the same explicitly. But this higher being certainly had not found a definite place in liturgy but possibly in the hearts and the minds of the people with common sense.

among them. To say the least: it hints at an identity in some aspect, compare for instance Ch. Up. 7,6,1: 7,1: 8,1: 10,1:. The very same we might discover in BAU. 1,4,10: where *devas, ṛṣis* and *manuṣyāḥ* equally awakened about the same object. So the great *ṛṣi Vāmadeva* may be held to have said: *aham brahmāsmîti sa idaṃ sarvaṃ bhavati*, "I am brahma and he became this universe" and he continues in Senart's translation [8]): "et les dieux mêmes ne peuvent l'en empêcher; car il est leur atman;" *tasya ha na devāś ca nābhūtyā īśate, ātmā hy eṣam sa bhavati*. The text continues: *atha yo 'nyām devatām upāste: anyo 'sau, anyo 'ham asmîti, na sa veda*. "He that may think that this is a godhead, and I am another (or: something else) he has not any knowledge." BAU. 1,5,6: presents to us: *devās, pitaro manuṣyāḥ* just showing that as word, mind, and senses are related, so *devas, pitaras* and mankind as well.

The same passage verse 16 relates that there are three worlds: *manuṣya-lokaḥ, pitṛlokaḥ and devalokaḥ*. Nobody will suggest that men and his ancestors belong to a different *order*. So what about the *devas*? One might believe that no very great difference between them was assumed by the authors of the earliest Upaniṣads. BAU. 4,4,4: brings us the very same idea home: *tad yathā peśaskārī peśaso mātrām upādāya*: here we clearly see a craftsman forming from clay or other pliable material a new body for the same *ātman*. I do not like to translate *ātman* here, as it immediately implies a certain opinion that might be entirely false as to the text under discussion however rightly rendered in other passages. And the text goes on: *anyan navataraṃ kalyāṇataraṃ rūpaṃ kurute . . . , pitryaṃ vā gāndharvaṃ vai daivaṃ vā prājāpatyaṃ vā brahmaṃ vānyeṣāṃ vā bhūtānām*. This craftsman "makes a new and more handsome shape: may be that of an ancestor, a gandharva, a deva, a prajāpati, a brahma, or any other kind of being." This text seems to imply that the difference in every sort of existence is just a matter of body and shape. But the *ātman* (would "élan vitale" do, or "persoonlijkheidskern" or "soul"?) is the same in every being. So to say: the *essence in* each being is identical, the difference comes from the *nāmarūpa*: "name and shape" [9]) Maryla Falk speaking about several RV. texts e.g. 10,90,4: 1,164,41 - 42: and 3,38: concludes: "from the collation of these texts it appears that the existence of *nāmarūpa* is due to two consecutive acts of division first the separation of the two aspects of the universal Being, then the dismemberment of its two-in-one cosmic manifestation" (o.c. p. 4).

The *prāṇas* are his (*ātman*) functional names *tasyaitāni karmanāmāni* (cf. BAU. 1,4,7: and our author p. 16), his true name is *ātman*. Where St. Thomas Aquinas defines individuum as materia

evolves Prajāpati. Then there is written: *Prajāpatir (asṛjata) devān* "he created the *devas* or evolved them". I do not think that it is good to render *sṛj-* with "create", at least not in the strict sense, to make something ex nihilo or sine praejacente materia. A special research on the true contents of the term *sṛj-* is necessary. What S. Radhakrishnan [2]) wrote would barely suffice and does not seem to give us firm proof about the ideas of the Indians of the RV., but more of the opinions of the author. So let us propose *sṛj-* as "to produce" or "to be the cause of something, to create by emanation or development". And immediately we can read in BAU. 5,5,1: *Te devāḥ satyam evopāsate* "les dieux ne connaissaient que le réel". I do not see the value of *eva* in this quotation. Do they mean to say: the *devas* did not know anything about Prajāpati, brahma or the waters or, and this is quite possible too: did the *devas* acknowledge *satyam* only as their principium quo, as the most important of all?

I do not want to go into the details of *how* Vedic scientists thought that the waters emanated satyam, satyam brahman and brahman Prajāpati. Nor how we are to regard them, as persons or as absolutely impersonal beings. This question rises: is Brahman in the text to be regarded as *brahmā* or *brahman*? Even then it does not mean much, since we are apt to call God also Godhead and Divinity. And as we do not distinguish between this personal and impersonal expression, just the same might have happened to the Vedic primitive philosophers, who had to start developing a fixed and acceptable terminology.

2. Sometimes the use of the term *deva* does not tell us anything, e.g. when it is a vocative, and in cases like BAU. 6,3,1: *yāvanto devās tvayi Jātavedaḥ, tiryañco ghnanti puruṣasya kāmān* as "killing the desires in a person" need not be a true act of a *deva* or of a human being. It might be asserted of so many things and beings.

Ch. Up. 1,12,5: presents to us Varuṇa with the title *deva:* and it tells us *annam āharat* "he brings us food". BAU. 1,3,9: produces *Mṛtyu*, who unmistakably is death as *devatā dūr nāma*. Every one agrees on the unpleasantness of death and I do not see any reason to renounce or acknowledge anything special in a deeper meaning of *devatā* as concerning Mṛtyu.

3. We have already stated the fact that in RV. there was not always an essential difference between *devas* and human beings. The very same we have to face here. After having said in Ch. Up. 7,10,1: that "the waters have taken on several shapes" the text goes on stating which forms, i.e. earth, atmosphere, sky and mountains. Then, *yad devamanuṣyāḥ*. Here the text joins *deva* and men together in a *dvandva*-compound, which hides from us any essential difference

and Hume in his 13 Principal Upanisads translates: "This is the Rājana sāman as woven upon the divinities".

The same method of putting *devas* on a par with material things, thought of to have great influence, we find in Ch. Up. 4,17,2: where Agni and ṛc, Vāyu and Yajus, Aditya and sāman are identified. Ch. Up. 4,17,8: relates to us *lokas, devas* and *vedas* mentioned in the same phrase, whose power overcomes the mistakes in any sacrifice.

Ch. Up. 7,1,2: relates to us the conversation between a certain Nārada and Sanatkumāra. Sanatkumāra replies, giving account of all the knowledge he has gathered. And among all these he mentions: *sarpa-deva-jana-vidyām* "knowledge of serpents, of devas and men". The same occurs in 7,2,1: but there the author mentions — as he tells us — that vāk "speech" teaches us all possible knowledge: *divaṃca pṛthivīṃca vāyumca, ākalamcāpaśca tejaśca devāṃśca manuṣyāṃśca paśāṃśca*. Exactly the same thing happens over and over again; cf. BAU. 2,1,20: *prāṇāḥ, lokāḥ, devāḥ, bhūtāni*; cf. also BAU. 2,5,15:.

In BAU. 4,3: the author comes to speak on the state of sleep and dream and dreamless sleep. And he states inter alia that when asleep you believe to be a *deva*, a *rāja: deva iva, rājeva. Aham evedam, sarvo 'smīti manyate, so 'sya paramo lokaḥ*. "I am the universe, I am this all "he believes" and this *is* for him the highest heaven". *Deva, rājā*, universe, all mentioned on the same level. *If here* a tremendous difference is seen, no one really dreams of such a thing as being God.

In the same adhyāya and brāhmaṇa § 22 the author explains that absorbed in *ātman* — a *father* becomes a no-father, a mother a no-mother, *lokāḥ alokāḥ, devā adevāḥ, vedā avedāḥ.* He only puts *deva* between other beings and things. It certainly is of greater importance than fathers and mothers, but is still among worlds and vedas. BAU. 6,2,2: mentions the two roads of mortal beings: the road of ancestors and the road of the devas. *dve sṛti aśṛṇavam pitṛṇām ahaṃ devānām uta martyānām* The opposition is not between *devānām*, and *martyānām*, but between *pitṛṇām* and *devānām*.

One could be in doubt whether the Indians believed in identifications as mentioned above Did they see the *devas* as godlike beings, then we cannot help seeing Vedic man as stupid and primitive as identifying pure man-made things with divinity. But as our research on RV. and AV. seems to show that *deva* is a superhuman power, but surely not divine, there can be no difficulty in accepting the views expressed above.

Ch. Up. suggests clearly that *ṛc, sāman*, and *udgītha* are beings, personal or impersonal, with greater powers and vaster influences than the *devas*, cf. Ch. Up. 1,6,8: "he who sings these songs (*ṛc* etc.), he has command over worlds that are far away, even farther away

quantitate signata (De ente et essentia c. 2) there the Upaniṣads practically define speaking individuum: *ātman* qualified by *nāmarūpa*. Maryla Falk again: "knowledge of names is in fact knowledge of things, for according to the ancient Indian conception, names are no fortuitous designations, but are expressive of the innermost essence and power of the things named" (o.c. p. 16). While the name is the inner power of the individual being or thing, the *rūpa* is its physical appearance (o.c. p. 19) and the *rūpa* — the physical organism — is built up by the *prāṇa* which in its own essence remains "shapeless". But the authoress continues: "Reduced to its shapeless aspect of *prāṇa*, *rūpa* is no more actually different from the invisible *nāma*, as their separation depends only upon the physical manifestation of *rūpa*" (o.c. p. 20).

Accordingly, it seems to be obvious that the only difference between mand and *deva* is his *nāmarūpa*, and *rūpa* in its non-physical form is identical with *nāma*, and this is confirmed by the road to union with Brahman. There is no difference between *deva* and man. "Thus by knowledge one can reduce the variety of being, reconduct it to the primitive stage before the *rūpas* were mingled, that is to say, before the differentiation of name and form' '(o.c. p. 25).

4. We come across this same way of thinking, of putting *devas* and humans on the same level, also in other places. So we meet the *devas* put on the same footing as *ṛc* and *ṛṣi*. The *deva* may be something of very great influence and of great importance. Relating to Ch. Up. 1,3,9: they give us support and help.

Ch. Up. 1,10,9—11: imply that the *prastāva*, *udgītha* and *pratihāra* have in them — or are themselves "divinities". Especially as already in Ch. Up. 1,2,1: the *devas* conquered the *udgītham* by which they could overcome the *asuras*. And Ch. Up. 1,11,4: gives almost the same idea except that the *deva* who resides in or is in the *ṛc*, is *prāṇa* (5:) and in the *Udgītha* is āditya (in Senart's translation rendered as: "soleil"). Yet in *pratihāra* is annam "food". So here we even have to believe that the author does not like us to see any difference between *deva* and breath, *deva* and sunshine, *deva* and food. In short, that *deva* is something like a vital need. About the same in power as the mighty *ṛc* and *ṛṣi*.

Ch. Up. 2,20,1: places Agni, Vāyu, Aditya on a level with a sound, *prastāva* and *udgītha:* no talk about residing in or presiding over, but just *Agnir hiṅkāraḥ*.

Cp. Up. 1,13,2: equalized several *devas* e.g. Vāyu, Candramās, Agni, Aditya, viśve devāḥ, Prajāpati with several other sounds. Ch. Up. 2,20,1: makes the remark: *etad rājanaṃ devatāsu protam*. Which Senart renders as: "C'est le (*sāman*) Rājana réalisé dans les divinités"

and Hume in his 13 Principal Upanisads translates: "This is the Rājana sāman as woven upon the divinities".

The same method of putting *devas* on a par with material things, thought of to have great influence, we find in Ch. Up. 4,17,2: where Agni and ṛc, Vāyu and Yajus, Aditya and sāman are identified. Ch. Up. 4,17,8: relates to us *lokas, devas* and *vedas* mentioned in the same phrase, whose power overcomes the mistakes in any sacrifice.

Ch. Up. 7,1,2: relates to us the conversation between a certain Nārada and Sanatkumāra. Sanatkumāra replies, giving account of all the knowledge he has gathered. And among all these he mentions: *sarpa-deva-jana-vidyām* "knowledge of serpents, of devas and men". The same occurs in 7,2,1: but there the author mentions — as he tells us — that *vāk* "speech" teaches us all possible knowledge: *divaṃca pṛthivīṃca vāyuṃca, ākaśamcāpaśca tejaśca devāṃśca manuṣyāṃśca paśūṃśca.* Exactly the same thing happens over and over again; cf. BAU. 2,1,20: *prāṇāḥ, lokāḥ, devāḥ, bhūtāni*; cf. also BAU. 2,5,15:.

In BAU. 4,3: the author comes to speak on the state of sleep and dream and dreamless sleep. And he states inter alia that when asleep you believe to be a *deva*, a *rāja: deva iva, rājeva. Aham evedam, sarvo 'smiti manyate, so 'sya paramo lokaḥ.* "I am the universe, I am this all "he believes" and this is for him the highest heaven". *Deva, rājā*, universe, all mentioned on the same level. If here a tremendous difference is seen, no one really dreams of such a thing as being God.

In the same adhyāya and brāhmaṇa § 22 the author explains that absorbed in *ātman* — a father becomes a no-father, a mother a no-mother, *lokāḥ alokāḥ, devā adevāḥ, vedā avedāḥ.* He only puts *deva* between other beings and things. It certainly is of greater importance t[illegible] fathers and mothers, but is still among worlds and vedas. BAU. [illegible] of mortal beings: the road of ancestors [illegible] *devānām uta martyanam.* [illegible] *nām*, and *martyānām*, but between *pitṛṇām* and *devān*[illegible].

One could be in doubt whether the Indians believed in identifica-[illegible]. Did they see the *devas* as godlike beings, then [illegible] primitive as identifying pure man-made [illegible] ch on RV. and AV. seems to show that *deva* is a super[illegible], but surely not divine, there can be no difficulty in accepting the views expressed above.

Ch. Up. suggests clearly that *ṛc, sāman,* and *udgītha* are beings, personal or impersonal, with greater powers and vaster influences than the *devas*; cf. Ch. Up. 1,6,8: "he who sings these songs (ṛc etc.), he has command over worlds that are far away, even farther away

quantitate signata (De ente et essentia c. 2) there the Upaniṣads practically define speaking individuum: *ātman* qualified by *nāmarūpa*. Maryla Falk again: "knowledge of names is in fact knowledge of things, for according to the ancient Indian conception, names are no fortuitous designations, but are expressive of the innermost essence and power of the things named" (o.c. p. 16). While the name is the inner power of the individual being or thing, the *rūpa* is its physical appearance (o.c. p. 19) and the *rūpa* — the physical organism — is built up by the *prāṇa* which in its own essenc̨ remains "shapeless". But the authoress continues: "Reduced to its shapeless aspect of *prāṇa*, *rūpa* is no more actually different from the invisible *nāma*, as their separation depends only upon the physical manifestation of *rūpa*" (o.c. p. 20).

Accordingly, it seems to be obvious that the only difference between mand and *deva* is his *nāmarūpa*, and *rūpa* in its non-physical form is identical with *nāma*, and this is confirmed by the road to union with Brahman. There is no difference between *deva* and man. "Thus by knowledge one can reduce the variety of being, reconduct it to the primitive stage before the *rūpas* were mingled, that is to say, before the differentiation of name and form' '(o.c. p. 25).

4. We come across this same way of thinking, of putting *devas* and humans on the same level, also in other places. So we meet the *devas* put on the same footing as *ṛc* and *ṛṣi*. The *deva* may be something of very great influence and of great importance. Relating to Ch. Up. 1,3,9: they give us support and help.

Ch. Up. 1,10,9—11: imply that the *prastāva*, *udgītha* and *pratihāra* have in them — or are themselves "divinities". Especially as already in Ch. Up. 1,2,1: the *devas* conquered the *udgītham* by which they could overcome the *asuras*. And Ch. Up. 1,11,4: gives almost the same idea except that the *deva* who resides in or is in the *ṛc*, is *prāṇa* (5:) and in the *Udgītha* is āditya (in Senart's translation rendered as: "soleil"). Yet in *pratihāra* is annam "food". So here we even have to believe that the author does not like us to see any difference between *deva* and breath, *deva* and sunshine, *deva* and food. In short, that *deva* is something like a vital need. About the same in power as the mighty *rc* and *ṛṣi*.

Ch. Up. 2,20,1: places Agni, Vāyu, Aditya on a level with a sound, *prastāva* and *udgītha:* no talk about residing in or presiding over, but just *Agnir hiṅkāraḥ*.

Cp. Up. 1,13,2: equalized several *devas* e.g. Vāyu, Candramās, Agni, Aditya, viśve devāḥ, Prajāpati with several other sounds. Ch. Up. 2,20,1: makes the remark: *etad rājanaṃ devatāsu protam*. Which Senart renders as: "C'est le (*sāman*) Rājana réalisé dans les divinités"

and Hume in his 13 Principal Upanisads translates: "This is the Rājana sāman as woven upon the divinities".

The same method of putting *devas* on a par with material things, thought of to have great influence, we find in Ch. Up. 4,17,2: where Agni and ṛc, Vāyu and Yajus, Aditya and sāman are identified. Ch. Up. 4,17,8: relates to us *lokas, devas* and *vedas* mentioned in the same phrase, whose power overcomes the mistakes in any sacrifice.

Ch. Up. 7,1,2: relates to us the conversation between a certain Nārada and Sanatkumāra. Sanatkumāra replies, giving account of all the knowledge he has gathered. And among all these he mentions: *sarpa-deva-jana-vidyām* "knowledge of serpents, of devas and men". The same occurs in 7,2,1: but there the author mentions — as he tells us — that *vāk* "speech" teaches us all possible knowledge: *divaṃca pṛthivīṃca vāyuṃca, ākaśaṃcāpaśca tejaśca devāṃśca manuṣyāṃśca paśūṃśca.* Exactly the same thing happens over and over again; cf. BAU. 2,1,20: *prāṇāḥ, lokāḥ, devāḥ, bhūtāni*; cf. also BAU. 2,5,15:.

In BAU. 4,3: the author comes to speak on the state of sleep and dream and dreamless sleep. And he states inter alia that when asleep you believe to be a *deva*, a *rāja: deva iva, rājeva. Aham evedam, sarvo 'smīti manyate, so 'sya paramo lokaḥ.* "I am the universe, I am this all "he believes" and this is for him the highest heaven". *Deva, rājā*, universe, all mentioned on the same level. If here a tremendous difference is seen, no one really dreams of such a thing as being God.

In the same adhyāya and brāhmaṇa § 22 the author explains that absorbed in ātman — a father becomes a no-father, a mother a no-mother, *lokāḥ alokāḥ, devā adevāḥ, vedā avedāḥ.* He only puts *deva* between other beings and things. It certainly is of greater importance than fathers and mothers, but is still among worlds and vedas. BAU. 6,2,2: mentions the two roads of mortal beings: the road of ancestors and the road of the devas. *dve sṛtī aśṛṇavaṃ pitṛṇām ahaṃ devānām uta martyānām.* The opposition is not between *devānām,* and *martyānām*, but between *pitṛṇām* and *devānām.*

... in doubt whether the Indians believed in identifica- ... *devas* as godlike beings, then ... pure man-made things ... AV. seems to show that *deva* is a superhuman ... divine, there can be no difficulty in accepting the views expressed above.

Ch. Up. suggests clearly that ṛc, *sāman*, and *udgītha* are beings, personal or impersonal, with greater powers and vaster influences than the *devas*; cf. Ch. Up. 1,6,8: "he who sings these songs (ṛc etc.), he has command over worlds that are far away, even farther away

than the sun, and also of the desires of the devas"; and 1,7,6: tells us the same about men, but the next paragraph continues: "that such a person even conquers this world and everything *devas* may desire". Will this exaggeration tell us that the *ṛc*, *sāman* and *udgītha* have a great importance in Oriental hyperbolic wording? Or are we to believe that the Vedic Indian saw the power of his songs and melodies far above the powers of the *devas*? It may be both, but they stress especially the last.

5. What has been said under heading 4 implied that the *devas* had no unlimited power. In their strength they are limited as might be surmised from the tales about their struggle with the *asuras*. They got hold of the *udgītha* and so they were able to ward off the *asuras*; cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,1: 7: cf. also BAU. 1,3,1: 2: 7: and they got the better of them, *udgīthena (asurān) atyayāma*. The Aṅgirases and Bṛhaspati devoted themselves to the *udgītha* cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,10: 11:.

Limited is also the knowledge of the *devas* (and of the *asuras* as well) and they set out to acquire insight into the essence of *ātman* by which they could gain the worlds and could fulfil their desires; cf. Ch. Up. 8,7,2: and they went as *brahmacārins* to father Prajāpati for 32 years; cf. Ch. Up. 8,7,3:. When reading those chapters Ch. Up. 8,9,1: 8,10,1: 8,11,3: 8,12,6: we received the impression that the subjects were too deep for them and that Indra, yet heading the *devas*, was not the brightest pupil — at least he has been depicted there as having quite a number of difficulties; cf. Ch. Up. 9,1: and 10,1: 11,1: of the same 8th prapaṭhaka. And so the story finishes recording Indra having studied for over 101 years under the tutorship of Prajāpati. It does not make too good an impression. All these things become clear as we shall see afterwards, that knowledge and insight into the essence of nature and the Universe fulfil a man's desires and make him "immortal" i.e. full of vitality, vigorous and longliving. So according to Ch. Up. 1,4,2: the *devas* had some doubts about Mṛtyu: *devā vai mṛtyor bibhyatas trayīṃ vidyāṃ prāviśan*. "Then after penetrating into the three Vedas, they became immortals" *tat praviśya devā amṛtā abhayā abhavan* (Ch. Up. 1,4,4:). The very same story we find related in BAU. 5,2,1: etc. where *devas*, human beings and *asuras* receive their lessons from Prajāpati.

Their power over human life is not quite so vast as one would imagine. Their powers in giving life seem to have been divided among Viṣṇu, Tvaṣṭar, Prajāpati and Dhātar and some others; cf. BAU. 6,4,21:. Viṣṇu prepares the womb, Tvaṣṭar (the heavenly craftsman) the mould and shape of the new human being, Prajāpati impregnates and Dhātar gives life. But men ask several *devas* for fertility: *Sinīvāli garbhaṃ dhehi*, so they approach to the Aśvins and Vāyu.

But as a whole it does not seem that the late-Vedic period regards the *devas* as utmost powerful and majestic. They have lost much of their prestige and respect. They really make a poor show and are presented to us as little more than highly superior human beings.

6. The former position of the *devas*, when every one believed that almost everything might be received from their powers and intercession, has passed into something entirely new. It is *vidyā* "knowledge" by which anything may be reached, and the purport of the oldest Upanisads comes to this: everything can be had and acquired and gained by "true insight". So Ch. Up. 5,1,4: tells us that quite clearly: *yo ha vai sampadaṃ veda, sa hāsmai kāmāḥ padyante daivāś ca mānuṣāś ca*: "whoever knows thoroughly what is prosperity, for him all desires from human or divine origin will come true". Ch. Up. 8,12,6: acknowledges a great power to the *devas*, but that is only because they have the true insight into the *ātman*. This only accounts for those *devas*, who live in heaven (the world) of *brahman*. We quoted already above Ch. Up. 1,4,5: where knowledge has been taught as a means of becoming *devas* and "immortal". BAU. 1,3,16: says: "whoever knows the true essence of Mṛtyu and his ways, he will overcome Mṛtyu". *evaṃ ha vā enam eṣā devatā mṛtyum ativahati, ya evaṃ veda* "with the help of the devatā". BAU. 1,4,10: tells us that even the *devas* cannot influence for the worse a man who has true knowledge of *ātman* and *brahman*. So does BAU. 2,4,5: 6: *ātmano vā are darśanena śravaṇena matyā vijñānena idaṃ sarvaṃ viditam*; and 6: *idam brahma, idaṃ kṣatram ime lokāḥ, ime devāḥ, imāni bhūtāni, idaṃ sarvam yad ayam ātmā*. And how important this understanding is, BAU 3,7,1: tells us: *sa brahmavit, sa lokavit, sa devavit, sa vedavit, sa bhūtavit, sa ātmavit, sa sarvavit*: "he knows everything, who has insight in brahma, world, *deva* and *vedas*, beings and *ātman*". Really, BAU. 4,1,2—7: tells us that knowledge, expressed in words, makes us overlord over everything — makes us a deva, even gives us a place among the *devas*: *nainaṃ vāg jahāti enam bhūtāny abhikṣaranti sarvāni, devo bhūtvā devān āpyeti: ya evaṃ vidvān etad upāste!!* So it does not amaze us that BAU 4,4,16: relates that: *tad devā jyotiṣāṃ jyotiḥ, āyur ha upāsate 'mṛtam*: Radhakrishnan renders: "in front of which the year revolves with its days, that the gods worship as the light of lights, as life immortal"[5]). So it is only by the light of knowledge that the *devas* gained their immortality.

7. But more: one becomes a *deva* or at least "becomes one of them": *sa ya etad evam amṛtaṃ veda, vasūnām eva eko bhūtvā* (Ch. Up. 3,6,3:) and so by knowing the *amṛtam* one becomes one of the Rudras (Ch. Up. 3,7,3:) or one of the *ādityas* (3,8,3:) or of the Maruts (3,9,3:) or one of the Sādhyas (3,10,3:). Again I quote Ch. Up.

1,4,5: *tat praviśya yad amṛtā devās tad amṛto bhavati* which Senart renders: "en y pénétrant, il devient immortel comme les dieux". BAU. 1,4,15: instructs us about the way to *deva*-hood: *tasmād Agnāv eva deveṣu lokam icchante*, "c'est pourquoi c'est en Agni que l'on souhaite une place parmi les dieux"; and BAU. 1,5,1: relates: that who knows undestructibility, will go to the devas: *sa devān apigacchati.*

8. Nowhere we shall be able to trace signs of creatorship among the *devas*. It might come out of the hands of brahman (BAU. 1,4,6:) or Prajāpati, but surely nothing of the sort with the *devas*. Ch. Up. 1,7,7: 8: *atha ya etad evaṃvidvān sāma gāyate, ubhau sa gāyati, so amunaiva sa eṣa ye cāmuṣmāt parāñco lokās tāṃś cāpnoti devakāmāṃś ca*: "through the *sāman* one can gain worlds which are beyond and things desired by the *devas*". These quotations are to be cited to state that the *devas* are not the origin of this world and nowhere in Ch. Up. or in BAU. are we able to find a trace of this creatorship of the devas. Thus passages like: BAU. 1,4,6: *saiṣā brahmaṇo 'tisṛṣṭiḥ; yac chreyaso devān asṛjata; atha yan martyaḥ sann amṛtān asṛjata, tasmād atisṛṣṭiḥ*. They clearly give us the opinion of a difference between *devas* and human beings *(martyās)*. Radhakrishnan renders: "this is the highest creation of Brahmā, namely that he created the gods, who are superior to him. Although mortal himself he created the immortals. Therefore it is the highest creation". Here one feels that still no philosophical check exists on their thoughts, as it is quite evident that effectus quaerit causam proportionatam. So no mortal can give "immortality" except by instrumental action.

9. *Atman* is of far greater importance than any other force upon this earth or hereafter. BAU. 2,4,5: shows clearly in the summing-up that the driving force in every human being is his *ātman*; and we find the same in BAU. 4,5,6: *na vā are devānām kāmāya devāḥ priyā bhavanti, ātmanas tu kāmāya devāḥ priyāḥ bhavanti*. And BAU. 4,5,7: everything can be found in *ātman. Brahma, kṣatram, lokāḥ, devāḥ; vedāḥ: idaṃ sarvam yad ayam ātmā*. Really *devas* are one among other groups of influential or non-influential powers.

10. The *devas* have to be regarded as a group led by a chief. This chief is Indra; cf. Ch. Up. 8,7,2:. The *asuras* are headed by Virocana. It seems that the Indians of the late-Vedic period do not see much difference between them, except that the *asuras* are always out to inflict trouble; cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,2—6:. They both are descendants of Prajāpati and they both received their training in religious and philosophical knowledge from him (Ch. Up. 8,8,4:). So one might

believe that Prajāpati is really the God in sensu stricto, though I should not like to insist on this opinion. In quite a few texts he does not come second, but even lower on the ladder of gradation. Yājñavalkya is asked by his intelligent wife about the basis of everything: *kasmin nu khalu āpa otāś ca protāś ca iti*: she always receives an answer connected with room and space, *Vāyu, antarikṣa, Gandharvalokeṣu, candralokeṣu, nakṣatralokeṣu, devalokeṣu* (high and respectable place, but just below pure planetary spaces), *Indralokeṣu, Prajāpatilokeṣu* (even this is not the highest), *Brahmalokeṣu*. About their basis and foundation Yājñavalkya does not want to answer. It is too (magically) dangerous (BAU. 3,6,1:).

In a discussion of the foundations and their godheads (BAU. 3,9,12—24:) a number of old-time *devas* are mentioned; they do not show much gradation amongst themselves and one receives the impression that they all (Varuṇa, Soma, Agni, Yama, and others) belong to the rank and file. However, talking on the pleasures and joys of different *lokāḥ* — let alone what they thought them to be — we surely learn some kind of gradation: men, gandharvas, ancestors, *karmadevāḥ* and *ājānadevāḥ*, Prajāpati and *brahmalokāḥ* (BAU. 4,3,33:). Interesting is the distinction between *devas* through pious works and *devas* by origin. Maybe this tiny and trifling remark shows us that in the heart of the late-Vedic Indian the *devas* had still some hidden corner, where he felt olden times when the *devas* were looked upon as great and mighty superhuman beings. In connexion with this I should like to mention the *pathin devānām*. Already in RV. and AV. we came across this expression, but I omitted it from the research as it did not tell us more than that the *devas* travel along their own highways. But in Ch. Up. the *deva*-roads seem to have a somewhat greater importance and another meaning. It is not any longer the road of the *devas* only, but the way of the *devas* to Brahman as well. The importance is relevant (Ch. Up. 5,3,2:) *Vettha pathor devayānasya pitryānasyaca vyāvartanam iti*. And the context shows that this is a very vital question, for as the boy goes back to his father, he tells him the whole story and his father, in order to learn the answer, goes to the king and asks to become the king's disciple. Ch. Up. 4,15,5: relates the importance to us: *sa enaṃ brahma gamayati* "this road runs to brahman". *Eṣa devapatho brahmapathaḥ*, "this *deva*-way is the brahman road, whosoever follows this path, shall not have to come back" (i.e. die again). It also shows that the have to come to the higher and highest stage of happiness; and the *devas* are an intermediate stage between us and *brahman*. BAU. 4,3,33: and 6,2,15: tell us the same; from *devalokaḥ* we have to come to the highest stage of happiness; and the same story as related above about the important question concerning the *devapathin* is

1,4,5: *tat praviśya yad amṛtā devās tad amṛto bhavati* which Senart renders: "en y pénétrant, il devient immortel comme les dieux". BAU. 1,4,15: instructs us about the way to *deva*-hood: *tasmād Agnāv eva deveṣu lokam icchante*, "c'est pourquoi c'est en Agni que l'on souhaite une place parmi les dieux"; and BAU. 1,5,1: relates: that who knows undestructibility, will go to the devas: *sa devān apigacchati.*

8. Nowhere we shall be able to trace signs of creatorship among the *devas*. It might come out of the hands of brahman (BAU. 1,4,6:) or Prajāpati, but surely nothing of the sort with the *devas*. Ch. Up. 1,7,7: 8: *atha ya etad evaṃvidvān sāma gāyate, ubhau sa gāyati, so amunaiva sa eṣa ye cāmuṣmāt parāñco lokās tāṃś cāpnoti devakāmāṃś ca*: "through the *sāman* one can gain worlds which are beyond and things desired by the *devas*". These quotations are to be cited to state that the *devas* are not the origin of this world and nowhere in Ch. Up. or in BAU. are we able to find a trace of this creatorship of the devas. Thus passages like: BAU. 1,4,6: *saiṣā brahmaṇo 'tisṛṣṭiḥ; yac chreyaso devān asṛjata; atha yan martyaḥ sann amṛtān asṛjata, tasmād atisṛṣṭiḥ.* They clearly give us the opinion of a difference between *devas* and human beings *(martyās)*. Radhakrishnan renders: "this is the highest creation of Brahmā, namely that he created the gods, who are superior to him. Although mortal himself he created the immortals. Therefore it is the highest creation". Here one feels that still no philosophical check exists on their thoughts, as it is quite evident that effectus quaerit causam proportionatam. So no mortal can give "immortality" except by instrumental action.

9. *Atman is of far greater importance than any other force upon* this earth or hereafter. BAU. 2,4,5: shows clearly in the summing-up that the driving force in every human being is his *ātman*; and we find the same in BAU. 4,5,6: *na vā are devānām kāmāya devāḥ priyā bhavanti, ātmanas tu kāmāya devāḥ priyāḥ bhavanti.* And BAU. 4,5,7: everything can be found in *ātman. Brahma, kṣatram, lokāḥ, devāḥ; vedāḥ: idaṃ sarvam yad ayam ātmā.* Really *devas* are one among other groups of influential or non-influential powers.

10. The *devas* have to be regarded as a group led by a chief. This chief is Indra; cf. Ch. Up. 8,7,2:. The *asuras* are headed by Virocana. It seems that the Indians of the late-Vedic period do not see much difference between them, except that the *asuras* are always out to inflict trouble; cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,2—6:. They both are descendants of Prajāpati and they both received their training in religious and philosophical knowledge from him (Ch. Up. 8,8,4:). So one might

believe that Prajāpati is *really* the God in sensu stricto, though I should not like to insist on this opinion. In quite a *few* texts he does not come second, but even lower on the ladder of gradation. Yājñavalkya is asked by his intelligent wife about the basis of everything: *kasmin nu khalu āpa otāś ca protāś ca iti*: she always receives an answer connected with room and space, *Vāyu, antarikṣa, Gandharvalokeṣu, candralokeṣu, nakṣatralokeṣu, devalokeṣu* (high and respectable place, but just below pure planetary spaces), *Indralokeṣu, Prajāpatilokeṣu* (even this is not the highest), *Brahmalokeṣu*. About their basis and foundation Yājñavalkya does not want to answer. It is too (magically) dangerous (BAU. 3,6,1:).

In a discussion of the foundations and their godheads (BAU. 3,9,12—24:) a number of *old-time devas* are mentioned; they do not show much gradation amongst themselves and one receives the impression that they all (Varuṇa, Soma, Agni, Yama, and others) belong to the rank and file. However, *talking* on the pleasures and joys of different *lokāḥ* — let alone what *they* thought them to be — we surely learn some *kind* of gradation: men, gandharvas, ancestors, *karmadevāḥ* and *ājānadevāḥ*, Prajāpati and *brahmalokāḥ* (BAU. 4,3,33:). Interesting *is the* distinction between *devas* through pious works and *devas* by origin. Maybe this tiny and trifling remark shows us that in the heart of the *late*-Vedic Indian the *devas* had still some hidden corner, where he felt olden times when the *devas* were looked upon as great and mighty superhuman beings. In connexion with this I should like to mention the *pathin devānām*. Already in RV. and AV. we came across this expression, but I omitted it from the *research* as it did not tell us more than that the *devas* travel along their own highways. But in Ch. Up. the *deva*-roads seem to have a somewhat greater importance and another meaning. It is not any longer the road of the *devas* only, but the way of the *devas* to Brahman as well. The importance is relevant (Ch. Up. 5,3,2:) *Vettha pathor devayānasya pitryānasyaca vyāvartanam iti*. And the context shows that this is a very vital question, for as the boy goes back to his father, he tells him the whole story and his father, in order to learn the answer, goes to the king and asks to become the king's disciple. Ch. Up. 4,15,5: relates the importance to us: *sa enaṃ brahma gamayati* "this road runs to brahman". *Eṣa devapatho brahmapathaḥ*, "this *deva*-way is the brahman road, whosoever follows this path, shall not have to come back" (i.e. die again). It also shows that the *devas* are an intermediate stage of happiness; and the BAU. 4,3,33: and 6,2,15: tell us the same; from *devalokaḥ* we have to come to the highest stage of happiness; and the same story as related above about the important question concerning the *devapathin* is

found again in BAU. 6,2,2:.

According to our view Brahmā is surely the concept of the Highest Being or God in sensu stricto. Ch. Up. 3,14: already gives a descriptive definition of Brahman, which we could partly accept as of the Supreme Being. See also BAU. 4,5,15: and 4,4,22:. But worth noticing is that we find nowhere Brahmā mentioned as a *deva* or as belonging to a group of *devas*. Except one passage BAU. 1,4,6: where Senart explains in a note: "Agni et Soma étant les éléments du sacrifice, du brahman, le texte est, par ce détour, ramené à l'identification de *Brahman*." But we had better apply *brahman-ātman* to the *sarve devāḥ*. The *devas* may help us to Brahman! Ch. Up. 3,11,2: gives us a sort of prayer: *devās, tenāhaṃ satyena mā virādhiṣi brahmaṇā* rendered by Senart: "Aussi vrai, ô dieux, puissé-je ne jamais être séparé de brahman".

BAU. 1,4,12: *sa (brahma) viśam asṛjata yāny etāni devajātāni gaṇaśa ākhyāyante*: where Brahmā is the origin of the *deva*-generations, but in 15: there is a rather queer expression: *tad agninaiva deveṣu brahmābhavat*. Radhakrishnan renders this pericope: "among the gods that Brahmā existed as fire". The queer point is: *abhavat*. Senart renders it: "s'est réalisé" but this could be translated by "was" or "became". But this "*réalisé*" might be just a vague expression by which one can suggest everything without stating too much. "Realize" could be rendered as: to appear, to incarnate oneself, as Hume translates in his "The 13 principal Upanisads" [6]). Max Müller [7]) renders: "among the devas that Brahman existed as Agni (fire) only ..." But it could be too: "Brahma makes his power felt by Agni, expresses himself, realizes, materializes himself"; and one does not exaggerate in thinking that this last interpretation tallies with the idea of *abhavat deveṣu*, just as in: *etābhyāṃ hi rūpābhyāṃ brahmābhavat*, a few lines lower.

11. We meet the concept of *deva* in other expressions: the abstractum: *devatā* and the term *adhidevatam*. The former term being rendered by Hume, Müller and Radhakrishnan [8]) by "gods", the adverb is translated by Senart by "l'ordre objectif" in opposition to *adhyātman* rendered by "l'ordre subjectif", and on p. 44, he comments as follows: *devatāḥ* "les divinités désignent souvent les objets perceptibles et sensibles par opposition au *prāṇa*, à l'esprit qui perçoit: c'est dans ce sens que je traduis *adhidevatam* par le "point de vue objectif": Ch. Up. 3,18,2: gives a definition per partes However Ch. Up. 6,15,1: 2: suggest the use of *devatā* in the sense of Supreme Being: *tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām*, and BAU. 1,5,20: *yathaiṣā devatā, evaṃ saḥ*. Senart and Hume [9]) put after *devatā* Prajāpati between brackets. I do not see an intrinsic reason for this explanation, however in § 15 Prajāpati has been mentioned. Müller inserts "*Hiraṇyagarbha*" [10]), so does

Radhakrishnan. It certainly suggests here a supreme Being, being honoured and served by every being: *yathaitāṃ devatāṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny avanti, evaṃ haivaṃvidaṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny avanti.* And if Prajāpati has been thought behind this *devatām*, then certainly it means here more than anywhere else. Here it suggests no human or supernatural power, but divinity with capital D.

BAU. 3,6,1: Gārgī, searching for the last cause and foundation of the universe, asks: *kasmin nu khalu brahmalokā otāś ca protāś ceti?* And Yājñavalkya replies: *anatipraśnyāṃ vai devatām atipṛcchasi. Gārgi mātiprākṣīr iti.*" Do not keep on asking after that deity. It is dangerous: *mā te mūrdhā vipaptat* "beware that your head does not blow off". In other words your life is at stake. No doubt that also the Indian thinker feels the presence of God himself, whatever term he uses. Here the word *devatā* seems to have the meaning of God in sensu strictissimo. Ch. Up. 4,2,2,: *anu ma etāṃ, bhagavaḥ, devatāṃ śādhi, yāṃ devatām upāssa iti:* Hume: "now, sir, teach me that divinity, the divinity that you reverence". The context of *śādhi* and *upāsse* does not force us to accept *devatā* as God in sensu stricto, but it shows some inner longing. The person speaking in this passage is Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa and he does not believe so much in gods as in riches and the gods of the earth. He is a śudra. Maybe that implies an explanation.

12. BAU. 5,15,4: gives a short and beautiful prayer in metre. Though "give us this day our daily bread" has certainly not been forgotten, there is a touching request for forgiveness of sins: *yuyodhy asmaj juhurāṇam enaḥ* "remove from us sin [32]). Already RV. and AV. show us Agni — to whom the prayer is directed — as the physician, also of the wounds of the soul.

13. *Devas* and sacrifices belong together. Here too we are under the impression that the sacrifices are wanted by the *devas*. Moreover they need them and believe in them. They only create by offerings.

a) They wanted the rites: BAU. 3,8,9: *Yajamānaṃ devāḥ (praśaṃsanti)*, "the *devas* honour and exalt the offerer".

b) Ch. Up. 2,24,1: this whole khaṇḍa reveals to us the importance of sacrifice as it shows the regular practice of everyday life, in which the Vasus, Rudras, Adityas and Viśve Devas have their turns. *Devas* and sacrifice belong together. So BAU. 1,2,7: discloses to us the *aśvamedha* and other sacrificial animals: *paśūn devatābhyaḥ prayauhat*, and: *amuṃ yaja, amuṃ yajeti ekam-ekam devam* seems to be a proverb: "each divinity his own offering".

BAU. 1,4,16: *Atho 'yaṃ vā ātmā sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ lokaḥ:*

found again in BAU. 6,2,2:.

According to our view Brahmā is surely the concept of the Highest Being or God in sensu stricto. Ch. Up. 3,14: already gives a descriptive definition of Brahman, which we could partly accept as of the Supreme Being. See also BAU. 4,5,15: and 4,4,22:. But worth noticing is that we find nowhere Brahmā mentioned as a *deva* or as belonging to a group of *devas*. Except one passage BAU. 1,4,6: where Senart explains in a note: "Agni et Soma étant les éléments du sacrifice, du brahman, le texte est, par ce détour, ramené à l'identification de *Brahman*." But we had better apply *brahman-ātman* to the *sarve devāḥ*. The *devas* may help us to Brahman! Ch. Up. 3,11,2: gives us a sort of prayer: *devās, tenāhaṃ satyena mā virādhiṣi brahmaṇā* rendered by Senart: "Aussi vrai, ô dieux, puissé-je ne jamais être séparé de brahman".

BAU. 1,4,12: *sa (brahma) viśam asṛjata yāny etāni devajātāni gaṇaśa ākhyāyante:* where Brahmā is the origin of the deva-generations, but in 15: there is a rather queer expression: *tad agninaiva deveṣu brahmābhavat*. Radhakrishnan renders this pericope: "among the gods that Brahmā existed as fire". The queer point is: *abhavat*. Senart renders it: "s'est réalisé" but this could be translated by "was" or "became". But this "*réalisé*" might be just a vague expression by which one can suggest everything without stating too much. "Realize" could be rendered as: to appear, to incarnate oneself, as Hume translates in his "The 13 principal Upanisads" [6]). Max Müller [7]) renders: "among the devas that Brahman existed as Agni (fire) only ..." But it could be too: "Brahma makes his power felt by Agni, expresses himself, realizes, materializes himself"; and one does not exaggerate in thinking that this last interpretation tallies with the idea of *abhavat deveṣu*, just as in: *etābhyāṃ hi rūpābhyāṃ brahmābhavat*, a few lines lower.

11. We meet the concept of *deva* in other expressions: the abstractum: *devatā* and the term *adhidevatam*. The former term being rendered by Hume, Müller and Radhakrishnan [8]) by "gods", the adverb is translated by Senart by "l'ordre objectif" in opposition to *adhyātman* rendered by "l'ordre subjectif", and on p. 44, he comments as follows: *devatāḥ* "les divinités désignent souvent les objets perceptibles et sensibles par opposition au *prāṇa*, à l'esprit qui perçoit: c'est dans ce sens que je traduis *adhidevatam* par le "point de vue objectif": Ch. Up. 3,18,2: gives a definition per partes. However Ch. Up. 6,15,1: 2: suggest the use of *devatā* in the sense of Supreme Being: *tejaḥ parasyām devatāyām*, and BAU. 1,5,20: *yathaiṣā devatā, evaṃ saḥ*. Senart and Hume [9]) put after *devatā* Prajāpati between brackets. I do not see an intrinsic reason for this explanation, however in § 15 Prajāpati has been mentioned. Müller inserts "Hiraṇyagarbha" [10]), so does

acahat, so the Gandharvas do, the Asuras and also human beings as they mount their horses.

d) They drink and eat; cf. Ch. Up. 5,2,7: *vayaṃ devasya bhojanam* and that is here: sacrifice; cf. also Ch. Up. 5,10,4: *eṣa somo rājā, tad devānām annam, taṃ devā bhakṣayanti*. This too has some relation to sacrifice and rites. Even in these times the *soma* pressing seems to have been the king among the offerings. BAU. 6,2,16: tells us that [illegible]

So they live on *amṛtam* (*Soma*) and they do not make use of earthly food. Still it seems, they are desirous of nourishment. Maybe even they cannot do without?

c) Ch. Up. 4,3,6: asks for the *deva*, who is the protector of this world. *Mahātmanaś caturo deva ekaḥ kaḥ sa jagāra bhuvanasya gopāḥ?* Ch. Up. 4,3,7: says about him: *ātmā devānāṃ, janitā prajānām*. The solution of the [illegible] his note suggests [15]), Radha[illegible] of gods, the creator of all [illegible] add any further explanation.

That the *devas* are protecting us, says also Ch. Up. 2,22,3: 4: Indra (3) and Prajāpati (4) are mentioned in prayer: *Indram* (Prajāpatim) *śaraṇaṃ prapanno 'bhūvam*.

e) We hear Aditya called the *devamadhu*: "honey of the devas"; cf. Ch. Up. 3,1,1:.

f) The number of the *devas*. It is not limited to a certain fixed number: we came across: *tisrah*, which implies in casu Agni, Vāyu, Prajāpati. Ch. Up. 4,17,2: also Ch. Up. 6,3,3: 4: 4,7: 8,6:.

We hear *eka* mentioned in Ch. Up. 6,3,3: 4: and 4,7: and one gets the impression that there might have been sometime and somewhere a tendency to reduce the number of *devas* as far as possible.

BAU. 3,9,1: ff. introduce to us a method of reducing the number of *devas*. Starting from the traditional Vedic number 3333, we come via 33, 6, 3, 2, and 1½ to one. And characteristically for their atomistic, even materialistic way of thought: *katama eko deva iti?* Beautiful problem! Who is that only God? But the answer is very disappointing: *prāṇa iti, sa brahmā tyad ity ācakṣate*: "breath, that is *Brahman*, that we call transcendent". But presupposing Brahma-ātman as identical, we find a good definition in BAU. 3,9,26:. He is

"ātman is the world wherein every creature moves about". *sa yaj juhoti, yad yajate tena devānāṃ lokaḥ*: "world of the devas is for him who sacrifices". Radhakrishnan [13]) renders this passage thus: "now this self verily is the world of all beings. In so far as he makes offerings and sacrifices, he becomes the world of the Gods"; and the author explains *loka* as "world, object or enjoyment". But further on he says: "the interdependence of man and the world including deities, seers, fathers, animals, is brought out". BAU. 1,5,2: explains the verse: *dve devān abhājayat* by: *hutaṃca prahutaṃca; tasmād devebhyo juhvati ca pra ca juhvati* "of two he lets take part the gods; therefore one offers by *hutam* and *prahutam*."

BAU. 3,1,8: 9: explains the connexion between sacrifice and *devas*, and even *brahman*, and here I refer to Radhakrishnan op. cit. p. 213 f.

c) Even the *devas* themselves believe in bringing offers. BAU. 6,2,9—14: reveal the *devas* sacrificing and making offerings. Ch. Up. 5,4,2: *tasminn etasminn agnau devāḥ śraddhām juhvati* "into this fire the *devas* are offering their faith", and this offering of the *devas* is disclosed in the 5tr—8th khaṇḍa of the same prapāṭhaka.

d) So we come to our last point: sacrificing, the *devas* create or produce vital elements and even other *devas*. Here Ch. Up. 5,4: is a duplicate of BAU. 6,2: etc. Ch. Up. 5,4,2: *tasyāhuteḥ somo rājā sambhavati*: "out of this offering king Soma received birth".

14. Several epithets are given to the devas, not like in RV. and AV. time and again, but once or twice:

a) *amṛtatvam* Ch. Up. 2,22,2: *Amṛtatvaṃ devebhya āgāyānīty āgāyet* [14]); cf. also BAU. 3,9,10: where *amṛtam* itself is called a *devatā*.

b) They do not know any evil (physical, psychical or moral) *na ha vai devān pāpaṃ gacchati* BAU. 1,5,20:. On evil and the delivery from evil S. Rodhe wrote a very interesting paper. He states the following facts: In RV. *pāpa* is mostly used in a moral sense (p. 30); there the derivative *pāpman* does not appear (p. 33). AV. uses *pāpman* as ethical and physical evil (p. 33). S. Br. sees it as wrong-doing, in which sense also the Upaniṣads use it (p. 34). He adds: "as a rule *pāpa* is used adjectively characterizing an evil-minded man or woman or an evil deed" (36). Worth noticing is his remark on p. 38: "But also sin is regarded as a physical evil, not strictly distinguished from disease, it is believed to be the cause of, and so deliverance from *pāśa* (which he mentioned p. 37 as a synonym of *pāpa*) may mean deliverance from sin too".

c) They have a riding animal; cf. BAU. 1,1,2: *Hayo bhūtvā devān*

deva entre les deva, nous avons atteint la lumière la plus haute."

The phrase *tisro devatāḥ* points the same way. As regards Ch. Up. 6,3,2: Senart puts this passage between brackets. We find the same in Ch. Up. 6,8,6: but more explicitly mentioned. BAU. 3,9,3—9: 10—19: suggests the same explanation, where we find *annam* (10) *striyaḥ* (11) *satyam* (12) *diśaḥ* (13) *mṛtyu* (14) *asu* (15) explained as *devatās*. I have no doubt that no Indian would ever have believed those senses and experiences to be a deity, but regarded them as powers, natural and supranormal, he could not cope with. Forces above his power and therefore felt as super-natural although preternatural which is more correct.

Surveying the epithets attributed to the idea of *deva* in Ch. Up. and BAU. nothing forces us to see *deva, devatā* as Supreme Being. Except in a few singular cases where it concerns once Prajāpati (and some doubt about the correct interpretation is possible) and the other times *brahman-ātman*. Again I think it worthwhile to repeat: we do not hear *brahman-ātman* called anywhere: *deva*. To me this is the soundest proof that *deva* surely does not mean God in the strict sense of the term.

Opinions of the Authorities.

Again we discover that for the greatest number of modern authors the concept of *deva* has been no problem, so one has to read between the lines and try to discover what they thought of it.

E. W. Hopkins in his "Religions of India": "In the period immediately following the Brāhmanas or toward the end of the Brāhmanic period, as one will, there is a famous distinction made between the gods. Some gods, it is said, are spirit-gods, some are work-gods. They are born of spirit and of works respectively" (p. 209). And coming more to the point: "In the exposition of this doctrine the old gods are retained as figures. They are not real gods. But they are existent forms of God. They are portions of the Absolute, a form of the Eternal even as man, a form of the same Absolute Being, again described as anthropomorphic" (p. 220). The author does not realize that in a great number of Upanisads this has never been said and that the Upanisads are not handbooks of fixed theories or philosophical handbooks, but just a juxtaposition of several opinions [illegible] philosophical in [illegible] gions of India' [illegible] is the discover; [illegible] gods are but the forms of the ego, and their heaven is mortal. It is false to deny the gods. Indra and the Father-God (Prajāpati) exist, just as men exist, as transient forms of Brahmā".

Kumarappa in his "Hindu conception of the Deity" states that

the basis and foundation of everything even of the eight *devas*, which is the last number mentioned.

This doubt about the number of *devas*, and the obvious discontent shows a tendency towards a new idea: an abstract force, ruling the world and its foundations.

15. *Devas* are revealed to us in battle with the *Asuras*; cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,1: BAU. 1,3,1:. It is truly the struggle for paramountcy; whereas in the Vedas *the asuras were higher in rank than the devas, here they* are their elderly relations, mischievous and wicked brethren. *Devas* do not win by their own power or cleverness, but just by being *shrewd*. They know how to get hold of the great powers of the udgitha and how to use it. The *asuras* might have been the bad brothers, but what about the *devas*? Ch. Up. 1,2,7: presents them to us as the killers of their brothers.

16. Each *deva* — at least of a certain ability and capacity — seems to have his own dominion, cf. Ch. Up. 2,24,5: 9: 13: or *sāmrājya*. So Agni (5) Vāyu (9) Viśvadeva (13). BAU. 3,9,1: ff. disclose the very same.

17. We have now come to the all-important problem: what exactly did the late-Vedic Indian and his authors, compilers of Ch. Up. and BAU. see in a *deva*? What kind of description and definition has he himself given?

Senart commenting on Ch. Up. 3,13,1: *tasya ha vā etasya hṛdayasya pañca devasuṣayaḥ. Sa yo 'sya prāṅ suṣiḥ sa prāṇaḥ, tac cakṣuḥ sa ādityaḥ.* "Le coeur a cinq canaux des *deva*. Le canal de l'est c'est prāṇa, c'est la vue, c'est le soleil", and he says of *deva*: "C'est à dire des "sens", qui sont souvent qualifiés de "dieux" *(deva)* et mis en relation avec les souffles vitaux" o.c. p. 37.

Ch. Up. 4,3,4: *tau vā etau dvau saṃvargau: vāyur eva deveṣu, prāṇaḥ prāṇeṣu*: here we see deva and prāṇa put on the same level. BAU. 1,5,17: is so daring to call *devāḥ prāṇā: sa putreṇaivāsmiṃl loke pratitiṣṭhati; athainam ete devāḥ prāṇā amṛtā āviśanti*; and again BAU. 1,5,22: *sa yathaiṣāṃ prāṇānāṃ madhyamaḥ prāṇaḥ, evam etāsāṃ devatānāṃ vāyuḥ.* Again we see Vāyu on the same level as *prāṇa*.

This very comparison with natural powers would make us believe that *deva* is something like a force of nature. A force above human strength, a power exceeding every human effort. Ch. Up. 3,17,7: *ud vayaṃ tamasaḥ pari jyotiḥ paśyanta uttaraṃ svaḥ paśyanta uttaram devaṃ devatrā sūryam aganma jyotir uttamam*, where Senart translates: "voyant, au sortir des ténèbres, la lumière supérieure, Sūrya

deva entre les deva, nous avons atteint la lumière la plus haute."

The phrase *tisro devatāḥ* points the same way. As regards Ch. Up. 6,3,2: Senart puts this passage between brackets. We find the same in Ch. Up. 6,8,6: but more explicitly mentioned. BAU. 3,9,3—9: 10—19: suggests the same explanation, where we find *annam* (10) *striyaḥ* (11) *satyam* (12) *diśaḥ* (13) *mṛtyu* (14) *asu* (15) explained as *devatās*. I have no doubt that no Indian would ever have believed those senses and experiences to be a deity, but regarded them as powers, natural and supranormal, he could not cope with. Forces above his power and therefore felt as super-natural although preter-natural which is more correct.

Surveying the epithets attributed to the idea of *deva* in Ch. Up. and BAU. nothing forces us to see *deva, devatā* as Supreme Being. Except in a few singular cases where it concerns once Prajāpati (and some doubt about the correct interpretation is possible) and the other times *brahman-ātman*. Again I think it worthwhile to repeat: we do not hear *brahman-ātman* called anywhere: *deva*. To me this is the soundest proof that *deva* surely does not mean God in the strict sense of the term.

Opinions of the Authorities.

Again we discover that for the greatest number of modern authors the concept of *deva* has been no problem, so one has to read between the lines and try to discover what they thought of it.

E. W. Hopkins in his "Religions of India": "In the period immediately following the Brāhmaṇas or toward the end of the Brāhmanic period, as one will, there is a famous distinction made between the gods. Some gods, it is said, are spirit-gods, some are work-gods. They are born of spirit and of works respectively" (p. 209). And coming more to the point: "In the exposition of this doctrine the old gods are retained as figures. They are not real gods. But they are existent forms of God. They are portions of the Absolute, a form of the Eternal even as man, a form of the same Absolute Being, again described as anthropomorphic" (p. 220). The author does not realize that in a great number of Upaniṣads this has never been said and that the Upaniṣads are not handbooks of fixed theories or philosophical handbooks, but just a juxtaposition of several opinions, that are only philosophical in sensu latiore. But what the same author in his "Religions of India" (p. 225) says, is quite true: "the relativity of divinity is the discovery of the Upaniṣads. The gods are but the forms of the ego, and their heaven is mortal. It is false to deny the gods. Indra and the Father-God (Prajāpati) exist, just as men exist, as transient forms of Brahmā".

Kumarappa in his "Hindu conception of the Deity" states that

the basis and foundation of everything even of the eight *devas*, which is the last number mentioned.

This doubt about the number of *devas*, and the obvious discontent shows a tendency towards a new idea: an abstract force, ruling the world and its foundations.

15. *Devas* are revealed to us in battle with the *Asuras*; cf. Ch. Up. 1,2,1: BAU. 1,3,1:. It is truly the struggle for paramountcy; whereas in the Vedas the *asuras* were higher in rank than the *devas*, here they are their elderly relations, mischievous and wicked brethren. *Devas* do not win by their own power or cleverness, but just by being *shrewd*. They know how to get hold of the great powers of the udgitha and how to use it. The *asuras* might have been the bad brothers, but what about the *devas*? Ch. Up. 1,2,7: *presents them to us as the killers of* their brothers.

16. *Each deva* — at least of a certain ability and capacity — *seems to have his own dominion, cf.* Ch. Up. 2,24,5: 9: 13: *or sāṃrājya.* So Agni (5) Vāyu (9) Viśvadeva (13). BAU. 3,9,1: ff. disclose the very same.

17. We have *now come to the* all-important *problem:* what exactly did the late-Vedic Indian and his authors, compilers of Ch. Up. and BAU. see in a *deva?* What kind of description and definition has he himself given?

Senart commenting on Ch. Up. 3,13,1: *tasya ha vā etasya hṛdayasya pañca devasuṣayaḥ. Sa yo 'sya prāṅ suṣiḥ sa prāṇaḥ, tac cakṣuḥ sa ādityaḥ.* "Le coeur a cinq canaux des *deva*. Le canal de l'est c'est prāṇa, c'est la vue, c'est le soleil", and he says of *deva*: "C'est à dire des "sens", qui sont souvent qualifiés de "dieux" (*deva*) et mis en relation avec les souffles vitaux" o.c. p. 37.

Ch. Up. 4,3,4: *tau vā etau dvau saṃvargau: vāyur eva deveṣu, prāṇaḥ prāṇeṣu:* here we see deva and prāṇa put on the same level. BAU. 1,5,17: is so daring to call *devāḥ prāṇā: sa putreṇaivāsmiṃl loke pratitiṣṭhati; athainam ete devāḥ prāṇā amṛtā āviśanti;* and again BAU. 1,5,22: *sa yathaiṣām prāṇānāṃ madhyamaḥ prāṇaḥ, evam etāsāṃ devatānāṃ vāyuḥ.* Again we see Vayu on the same level as *prāṇa.*

This very comparison with natural powers would make us believe that *deva* is something like a force of nature. A force above human strength, a power *exceeding every human effort.* Ch. *Up.* 3,17,7: *ud vayaṃ tamasaḥ pari jyotiḥ paśyanta uttaraṃ svaḥ paśyanta uttaram devaṃ devatrā sūryam aganma jyotir uttamam,* where Senart translates: "voyant, au sortir des ténèbres, la lumière supérieure, Sūrya

are subject to death, their life-spans varying according to the merit of each individual deva . . .".

But interesting to notice is still that the opinion of the "intellectuals" *of Upaniṣad-circles or of the rebellion in Indian thinking* — the Buddhists — who really did away with *devas* altogether, and only retained them to use them as serving spirits of the Buddha — that none *of them did receive a mass of followers.* They remained within their circles.

"Brahman is one without a second, may be said to be the theme of the Upaniṣads. All the gods and all the powers hitherto recognised are subordinate to Him" (p. 13). And he continues: "Yajnāvalkya systematically reduces the number of Gods from 3306 to one, and proclaims Him to be Brahman".

In short, the *devas* lost every importance and the Indians themselves did not care about the real background of the *devas*. Hume is of the same opinion in his: The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads: "In the Upaniṣads a further change occurred. The development of a monistic philosophy removed altogether the necessity of believing in the various Vedic and Brahmaṇic gods to superintend and operate the different departments of nature or to be coerced into man's service" (p. 52).

In „Die Lehre der Upanisaden" Oldenberg says of the essence of the *devas*: "Dort is Hauch, Auge, Rede, kurz der ganze Kreis der auf die Persönlichkeit bezüglichen Kräfte und Funktionen mit dem es diese Formeln und Erklärungen zu tun haben; hier sind es die kosmischen Gottheiten wie Erde, Luft, Himmel, Sonne, Mond." And Oldenberg proceeds: "Wie man durch Tapas die Götter in sich fühlte, ähnlich muszte es mit dem jenseitigen absoluten Selbst gelingen" (o.c. p. 224).

However, these are only the opinions of the authors and readers of the Upaniṣads. First the *devas* lost their position to rites and hymns, now to Brahmā, ātman and the like.

What did the common man think in those days? We cannot say exactly as we have practically no sources of information. We know that early dogmatical Buddhism had not such high respect for the *devas* as their Vedic contemporaries. We see Buddhism rename them as "factors of life" *dharma*, which H. von Glasenapp in his "Entwicklungsstufen des Indischen Denkens" renders with "Daseinsmächte". And so Buddhism makes them to nothing else than life-factors and powers that have influence in every stage of everyone's life.

G. P. Malalasekera in Dictionary of Pāli *proper names I, p. 1118* says on *deva*: "A class of beings. As a title the word *deva* is attributed to any being regarded, in certain respects, as being above the human level. Thus it is used for a king. In a late classification there are three kinds of deva: sammutidevā (conventional gods — e.g. kings and princes); visuddhidevā (beings who are divine by the purity of their great religious merit — arahants and Buddhas) and uppattidevā (beings who are born "divine")." The author continues below: "the devas are generally regarded as sharing kinship and continuity of life with humans; all devas have been men, and may again be born among men ... All devas are themselves in *saṃsāra*, needing salvation. They

are subject to death, their life-spans varying according to the merit of each individual deva ...".

But interesting to notice is still that the opinion of the "intellectuals" of Upaniṣad-circles or of the rebellion in Indian thinking — the Buddhists — who really did away with *devas* altogether, and only retained them to use them as serving spirits of the Buddha — that none of them did receive a mass of followers. They remained within their circles.

"Brahman is one without a second, may be said to be the theme of the Upaniṣads. All the gods and all the powers hitherto recognised are subordinate to Him" (p. 13). And he continues: "Yajnāvalkya systematically reduces the number of Gods from 3306 to one, and proclaims Him to be Brahman".

In short, the *devas* lost every importance and the Indians themselves did not care about the real background of the *devas*. Hume is of the same opinion in his: The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads: "In the Upaniṣads a further change occurred. The development of a monistic philosophy removed altogether the necessity of believing in the various Vedic and Brahmanic gods to superintend and operate the different departments of nature or to be coerced into man's service" (p. 52).

In „Die Lehre der Upanisaden" Oldenberg says of the essence of the *devas*: "Dort is Hauch, Auge, Rede, kurz der ganze Kreis der auf die Persönlichkeit bezüglichen Kräfte und Funktionen mit dem es diese Formeln und Erklärungen zu tun haben; hier sind es die kosmischen Gottheiten wie Erde, Luft, Himmel, Sonne, Mond." And Oldenberg proceeds: "Wie man durch Tapas die Götter in sich fühlte, ähnlich muszte es mit dem jenseitigen absoluten Selbst gelingen" (o.c. p. 224).

However, these are only the opinions of the authors and readers of the Upaniṣads. First the *devas* lost their position to rites and hymns, now to Brahmā, ātman and the like.

What did the common man think in those days? We cannot say exactly as we have practically no sources of information. We know that early dogmatical Buddhism had not such high respect for the *devas* as their Vedic contemporaries. We see Buddhism rename them as "factors of life" *dharma*, which H. von Glasenapp in his "Entwicklungsstufen des Indischen Denkens" renders with "Daseinsmächte". And so Buddhism makes them to nothing else than life-factors and powers that have influence in every stage of everyone's life.

G. P. Malalasekera in Dictionary of Pāli proper names I, p. 1118 says on *deva*: "A class of beings. As a title the word *deva* is attributed to any being regarded, in certain respects, as being above the human level. Thus it is used for a king. In a late classification there are three kinds of deva: sammutidevā (conventional gods — e.g. kings and princes); visuddhidevā (beings who are divine by the purity of their
great religious
who are born
are generally
humans; all devas have been men, and may again be born among men ... *All devas are themselves in saṃsāra, needing salvation. They*

namen eines Gottes spalten sich von ihm als selbständige Göttergestalten ab".

But slowly the idea covered by the term *deva* was fading away. Where they were superhuman powers in the RV., they slowly [illegible] had still some influence, but they [illegible] .nd helpful and inclined to [illegible] just these awful qualities [illegible] ain reason also for their worship and their prayers for help, viz. to sooth those adverse powers. Surely, there has been a long period of development. No need to believe that the magical trait, just mentioned, has been always as strong as in later times. The RV. gives an impression of less strong magical influence than the AV. But we must never forget that the RV. shows far more priestly influence, than the somewhat more popular AV.

As the Indians tried always to eliminate those adverse powers, they tried by prayers and by rites and magic songs and magical offerings to put aside their fright for the *devas*. Once they overcame this fear, the worship had gone too. We saw this stage coming on in the Brāhmaṇas and growing to full force in the early Upaniṣadic Period. So in this latest epoch of our research, we see that the Vedic Indian looked for other means as well. They found them in their own thoughts. Deep meditation and reflection on life and its components, social and religious life, enabled them to discard their fear for dark powers. They [illegible] the same fear for the instability of this earthly existence, arose the fear of repeated death and the cyclical return of birth. Here originated the striving for *mokṣa*.

But there arises another problem. Has the term *deva* also been the term for God in sensu stricto to the Vedic Indian? If not, so, had they any notion of something higher? In his "die Lehre der Upanisaden" Oldenberg already states: [illegible] den Gottes der seinem Weser [illegible] Glaubens völlig verschieden [illegible] "Gott", tritt wie bekannt sporadisch schon in sehr alter Zeit auf" (o.c. p. 236).

However, we cannot come to firm conclusions. The Vedas are works of the intellectuals, so we do not know much about the "commoner". But even to the composers of the Vedas there have been doubts about the divinity (in sensu stricto) of the *devas*. During

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing the study we made of *deva*, we must state that it is impossible to give a fixed meaning of the concept of *deva*, as the contents of the concept have been changing all the time. Right from the beginning we saw a change in value between the Rigveda and the Atharvavedic use of this term concerned. Again in Brahmanic and afterwards in the Upanișadic period. But one has to admit that the alterations have been always towards lessening its import.

In the RV. the conception of *deva* was fairly high and I am forced to believe that in pre-Vedic times or at least in the period before the composing of the RV., the idea of *deva* to "Indian" man might have been the idea of God in sensu stricto. If this happened really in India is another problem not to be solved here. But in Vedic times, I would suppose, the concept of *deva* became a term used for superhuman powers and forces, influencing the Indian in those ages very strongly. It contained some divine traits of character, practically confined to Varuṇa or Mitra-Varuṇa. Prof. A. A. Macdonell in "Vedic Mythology" states: "Varuṇa's character resembles that of the divine ruler in a monotheistic belief in an exalted type" (p. 3).

E. W. Hopkins, speaking on Varuṇa in his "Religions of India", p. 63: "In the portrait of such a god as this, one comes very near to monotheism. The conception of an almost solitary deity, recognised as watcher of wrong, guardian and primitive creator approaches more closely to unitarianism than does the ideal of any physical power in RV." Grassmann and Ludwig von Schröder were of the same opinion [1]).

L. von Schröder in his: "Arische Religion", I, p. 295, states (what we would like to ascertain) that it is a general usage that new oncoming ideas borrow their names from the older already existing and named figures. Thus also Deva had been borrowed from other powers. Schröder says: "Alte Göttergestalten verblassen, verändern sich bis zur Unkenntlichkeit oder verschwinden völlig. Neue und immer neue Gestalten tauchen auf, aus verschiedenen oft unbekannten Quellen und Schichten, setzten sich neben die alten oder an dessen Stelle, wachsen hoch empor, erfüllen das Bewusztsein, doch auch sie ohne Gewähr stetiger Dauer. Namen wechseln und verschieben sich. Bei-

may we pay worship with oblation?" And the following stanza 2—8 give the presumed qualities of such a deva: 2: *Mahitvaiko rājā ... yasya chāyāmṛtaṃ yasya mṛtyuḥ*. 3: He fixed and confirmed the two world-spheres *krandasī avatas caskabhāne* ... 4: "by the greatness of whom the wide heaven and great earth, of whom yon wide atmosphere, of whom yon sun is extended": *yasya dyaur urvī pṛthivī ca mahī yasyād urv antarikṣam, yasyāsau sūro vitato mahitvā*.

6: "The waters in the beginning favoured the all, assuming an embryo, the immortal, order-knowing one, over whom, divine ones, the god was" (Whitney-Lanman): *āpo agre viśvam āvan garbhaṃ dadhānā amṛtā ṛtajñāḥ yāsu devīṣv adhi deva āsīt, kasmai* etc.

AV. 10,8,1: is called by the translator "mystic". And practically every verse of this hymn is of great importance. The industrious reader may test it for himself. I only want to quote a few lines:

22: "who shall worship the everlasting god, who gives superiority."

28: it is called "*eka deva* and *prathamajo jātaḥ*".

30: we encounter the same again "everlasting, born of old". And stanza 1: calls this being: "the Chief Brahman". Even AV. 19,54,5: makes a suggestion in this direction: "this time goes on as highest god".

3. The Brāhmaṇas.

They sometimes too allude to a Supreme Being. Jaim. Brāhmaṇa Auswahl § 77: *yasmāj jāto na paro 'nyo asti ya ābabhūva bhuvanāni viśvā prajāpatiḥ prajayā saṃrarāṇas trīṇi jyotīṃsi sacate sa ṣoḍaśīti*· and Caland translates: "Höher als welcher kein anderer geboren ist, er, der alle Wesen umfasst. Prajāpati mit den Geschöpfen sich zusammen finded, ist mit den drei Leuchten verbunden". So from the same work § 160: *Prajāpatir vāvedam agra eko 'srjyata nānyaṃ dvitīyaṃ paśyamānaḥ: sa aikṣatā: 'haṃ vāva prathamo 'janiṣy aham śreṣṭho smy. asti svin mad ihānyā 3 iti: sa vyaikṣata: so 'nyad ātmano 'dhy uttarato jyāyas tiṣṭhad apaśyat; tad apṛcchat: kim idam asi, yad idam asīti? brahma vā asmīty abravīt*, and J. Up. Brāhmaṇa 3,1,1: *ekā ha vāva kṛtsnā devatā 'rdhadevatā evā 'nyāḥ, ayam eva yo 'yam pavate: eṣa eva sarveṣām devānām grahāḥ*. "One entire deity there is: the others are half-deities, this one namely who cleanses: He is the seizer of all the devas."

And J. Up. Br. 3,2,2: 4: *tau ho 'pajagau mahātmanaś caturo deva ekaḥ. kas sa jagāra bhuvanasya gopāḥ*. "He sang unto them: One god — who is he? — swallowed up four magnanimous ones, being a keeper of creation" and the answer is given in 10: *Prajāpatir vai kaḥ, sa hai 'taj jagāra bhuvanasya gopā iti*.

I am not going to state absolutely that these quotations prove

my research it often struck me that behind the *devas* there was at the back of the Indian mind either a remembrance of some old belief in a *deva* (in the strict sense) and this might have been Varuṇa or someone else, or if not a remembrance, then a vague thought that there should be someone else. We do find some places to confirm this.

1. In the RV.

cf. 1,164,6 ff: 10,82,2: 5: 6: and also 10,129,1: and 2:. Here we find the troubling question about *Ekam*, "das Eine" as Geldner translates.

Ekam is impersonal. The question about this *ekam* asks for a solution. The authorities are truly at a loss, but their common sense only tells them that there has to be something at the back of everything. RV. 1,164,10: is a question about the personal part of that *ekam*. I would compare RV. 10,121,1—10: the answer to the question: who is that God: *kasmai devāya*, is Prajāpati in stanza 10. Geldner has a note attached to it under 1d: "Da der Urgott und erste Schöpfer nicht unter den bekannten Göttern ist, so wird als Refrain die Frage aufgeworfen, welchem Gott nun eigentlich diese Ehre gebühre". So in 1,164,10: the problem is to be solved: who is "the only Lord of creation, the only king, who fixed heaven and earth?"

Also in 3,56,2: the poet inquires "der Eine" as Geldner renders *ekam*. He adds a note: "Der eine Urgott als Sonne oder Jahr nach Sāyaṇas Meinung" (p. 229) and on p. 403 (I) Geldner explains: "Der Eine ist wohl identisch mit dem Stier Viśvarūpa. So erklären sich die Kühe". Cf. also 3,38,4:. Sāyaṇa however thinks of the year and its six seasons. May be the six burdens are the three Heavens and Earth (cf. 7,87,5:) or the *ṣal urvīḥ* (6,47,3:) the six *rajāṃsi* which in 1,164,6: have been discerned by the Unborn and three fathers and mothers, whom 1,164,10: the one carries.

2. In the AV.

AV. 5,11,6: Withney translates: "There is one other thing beyond the welkin, there is something hard to attain, hitherward from what is beyond: this, I Varuṇa, knowing it, proclaim to thee." Whitney observes: that this verse befits Varuṇa's mouth (I, p. 238) and Lanman wants to translate: "There is one other thing beyond the welkin (and) beyond (that) one thing (is) something hard to get at *durṇalaṃ cit* (if you start) from this side (of them)".

4,2,1: *Ya ātmadā baladā yasya viśva upāsate praśiṣaṃ yasya devāḥ, yo 'syeśe dvipado yaś catuṣpadaḥ: kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema.* And Whitney renders: "He, who is soul-giving, strength-giving, of whom all, of whom even the gods, wait upon instruction; who is the Lord of these bipeds, who of quadrupeds — to what god

may we pay worship with oblation?" And the following stanza 2—8 give the presumed qualities of such a deva: 2: *Mahitvaiko rājā . . . yasya chāyāmṛtaṃ yasya mṛtyuḥ.* 3: He fixed and confirmed the two world-spheres *krandasī avatai caskabhāne . . .* 4: "by the greatness of whom the wide heaven and great earth, of whom yon wide atmosphere, of whom yon sun is extended": *yasya dyaur urvī pṛthivī ca mahī yasyād uru antarikṣam, yasyāsau sūro vitato mahitvā.*

6: "The waters in the beginning favoured the all, assuming an embryo, the immortal, order-knowing one, over whom, divine ones, the god was" (Whitney-Lanman): *āpo agre viśvam āvan garbhaṃ dadhānā amṛtā ṛtajñāḥ yāsu devīṣv adhi deva āsīt, kasmai* etc.

AV. 10,8,1: is called by the translator "mystic". And practically every verse of this hymn is of great importance. The industrious reader may test it for himself. I only want to quote a few lines:

22: "who shall worship the everlasting god, who gives superiority."

28: it is called "*eka deva* and *prathamajo jātaḥ*".

30: we encounter the same again "everlasting, born of old". And stanza 1: calls this being: "the Chief Brahman". Even AV. 19,54,5: makes a suggestion in this direction: "this time goes on as highest god".

3. The Brāhmaṇas.

They sometimes too allude to a Supreme Being. Jaim. Brāhmana Auswahl § 77: *yasmāj jāto na para 'nyo asti ya ābabhūva bhuvanāni trīvā prajāpatiḥ prajayā saṃrarāṇas trīṇi jyotiṃṣi sacate sa ṣoḍaśīti:* and Caland translates: "Höher als welcher kein anderer geboren ist, er, der alle Wesen umfasst, Prajāpati mit den Geschöpfen sich zusammen finded, ist mit den drei Leuchten verbunden". So from the same work § 160: *Prajāpatir vāvedam agra eko 'sṛjyata nānyaṃ dvitīyaṃ paśyamānaḥ; sa aikṣata: 'ham vāva* [illegible]

[illegible]

eva yo 'yam pavate: [illegible] One entire deity there is; the others are half-deities, this one namely who cleanses: He is the seizer of all the devas."

And J. Up. Br. 3,2,2: 4: *tau ho 'pajagau mahātmanaś caturo deva ekaḥ, kas sa jagāra bhuvanasya gopāḥ.* "He sang unto them: One god — who is he? — swallowed up four magnanimous ones, being a keeper of creation" and the answer is given in 10: *Prajāpatir vai kaḥ, sa hai 'taj jagāra bhuvanasya gopā iti.*

I am not going to state absolutely that these quotations prove

clearly that the Vedic Indian had evidence of, and a clear insight into, a Supreme Being. Vague as these quotations sometimes are in their questioning, or else in their shifting to Prajāpati, and from Prajāpati to Brahman, we have still to take the passages into consideration and we cannot ignore them. They had a meaning and they might have come from the depths of memory or out of olden songs and hymns of bygone times — unknown to us — but still living somehow in the memory of the people.

There is yet another way of approach to this problem.

The late Prof. B. A. G. Vroklage SVD. of Nijmegen University in his work: "Godsdienst der Primitieven" first of all quotes the Gaboen pygmees (p. 88 in his chapter about God), who call their deity: "who existed once all alone by himself"; and it is striking to see in the Brāhmaṇas Prajāpati called: "the one who was alone"; cf. P. Br. 4,1,4:.

And p. 104 Vroklage says: "God put on a par with his creature". After having given examples about this matter without number, he proceeds (p. 114): "so among tribes that are still near the basic culture (grondcultuur), but even more among the more advanced primitive peoples we very often encounter an identification of heaven with the Supreme Being". And p. 115: "this identification of the Supreme Being with the sky, has never grown out to real anthropomorphism. Moreover as the idea of Supreme Deity is one with heaven, its description *should remain vague and undefined*, as the sky does give all reasons to do so" [2]).

Now it is quite interesting that a number of authors have thought about our problem with reference to the Vedic religious life. L. von Schröder in Arische Religion, I, p. 306 states: "Es scheint also dasz sich ganz leicht und natürlich bei den verschiedensten Völkern aus dem Begriff "Himmel" der Begriff eines Höchsten oder doch eines groszen mächtig waltenden Gottes entwickelt. Wenn das aber der Fall ist, könnte da *nicht wirklich* Gruppe recht haben? Könnte nicht wirklich der Urindogermanische Himmelsgott Dyeus eine blosze Fiktion sein, und jedes der hier in Betracht kommenden Völker die erwähnte Begriffsentwicklung selbständig in seinem Sonderdasein nach der Trennung von den Stammverwandten durchgemacht haben?" On p. 301 he wrote: "Der urarische Name des Himmelsgottes Djêus stammt von derselben Wurzel wie das urarische Wort *deivo* oder deiwo "Gott". The Reallexikon der Indogerm. Altertumskunde 1923, I, p. 405 § 2 agrees: "*Daneben aber hatte sich schon in der* Ursprache eine Bezeichnung für den Begriff eines Gottes festgesetzt, die in einem anderen Anschauungskreis wurzelte: skt. deva, lat. deus (cf. also divus), lit. diewas, ir. dia, altn. tivar nom pl. (skt. divya, griech. dios, göttlich). Das sich so ergebende idg. deivo ist von der idg.

Bezeichnung des Himmels (s.d.) djeus, abgeleitet und bezeichnete, zunächst wohl rein lokal, solche Mächte wie Sonne, Mond, Morgen- [illegible]

[illegible] wenigstens auf einem Sprachgebiet, nämlich auf dem iranischen (vgl. aw. daēva, npers. dēv "Dämon, Teufel") die letztere Seite zur ausschliesslichen Herrschaft gelangt ist, falls man diesen Bedeutungswechsel nicht ausschliesslich dem Einflusz der Religion Zoroasters oder seiner Feindschaft den Indern gegenüber zuschreiben will."

And W. Havers in "Christus und die Religionen der Erde", Vienna, 1951, I, p. 710, also states that the Germanic Ziu Tyr is the old Heavenly God in close connexion with the Greek Zeus and Arian Dyaus pitā and Lat. Jupiter. He says: "Dieser scheinbare Widerspruch zwischen sprachwissenschaftlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Betrachtung [illegible] lische par excellence: d.h. den höchsten Himmelsgott."

So O. Karrer in "das Religiöse in der Menschheit und das Christentum", Freiburg, 1936, p. 14, states also: "So darf die Verehrung des "leuchtenden Himmels" vielmehr des Gottesgeheimnisses unter dem Bild des leuchtenden Himmels als Erbgut aus der idg. Vorzeit gelten."

Macdonell in his "Lectures on comparative Religion", p. 63, explains likewise: "In the Chinese popular religion Heaven is the highest God. The polytheistic Greek and Roman religions have Heaven as their highest God, Zeus-Pater and Jupiter is dyaus pitar"; cf. also "Arische Religion", I, p. 309, and Peter von Bradke follows suit. But not uncontradicted [illegible] remarks [illegible] Asura, [illegible] He ima[illegible] Iranian [illegible] an abs[illegible] other gods and suppressed Dyaus Pitar Asura, whereas it is quite certain that Varuna (asura) grew up out and over the other Asuras, his former equals." About the last clause "grew up out and over the *other* Asuras" I have a slight doubt. The RV. never says this.

But von Bradke never said that either; in Dyaus Asura, p. 19, he wrote: "Asura könnte ein Begriff sein der ursprünglich weder göttliches noch wiedergöttliches mit Notwendigkeit bezeichnend

sich zum einen und andern entwickelt hatte." But still in "Religions of India", p. 58, the author writes: "There is, to be sure, a formal acknowledgment of the fatherhood of Dyaus (among the gods he is father particularly of Dawn, the Aśvins and Indra as there is the *motherhood of Earth*), *but there is no further exaltation*". So L. von Schröder, o.c., p. 346: "Der Vatername deutete in den primitiven, streng vaterrechtlichen Zuständen der arischen Zeit wohl schon genug Herrschaft an. War doch der Vater der unumschränkte Herr der Groszfamilie während es eigentliche Herrscher und Könige zu jener Zeit wohl noch nicht gab"; and so, o.c., p. 319, von Schröder concludes that it seems quite probable that in those times before RV., the Indians really revered and honoured Dyaus Pitar and Dyaus Asura as their Heavenly father and Heavenly Lord, as their supreme Deity ruling over *devas* and human beings, but that in later periods Dyaus Pitar and Dyaus Asura had to hand over that sovereignity to Varuṇa Rājā of the Vedic Hymns. A. B. Keith in his "Indian Mythology", p. 21, follows Schröder: "The position of power and elevation which Greek mythology ascribes to Zeus, is not accorded in full to any Vedic deity, *but in so far as Zeus has a parellel, it is in Varuṇa, not in* Dyaus." W. Havers, o.c., p. 714, thinks that Hauer's [a]) conclusion is quite right: "Licht ist die beherrschende Vorstellung im religiösen Denken der Indogermanen seit uralters." After quoting he continues: "Gott wird als Quelle und als Inbegriff des Lichtes aufgefaszt. Diespiter-Juppiter war aber nicht blosz der "Taghimmel" wie man nach Schrader R.L., II, p. 235, meinen konnte, sondern der Gott des himmlischen Lichtes überhaupt, des nächtlichen wie des Tageslichtes, natürlich auch des Blitzlichtes, er was der Urheber des Lichtes slechthin, daher sein Beiname Lucetius" (vgl. Kretschmer Glotta 13, 112 f.).

So the authors who made a study of this problem, had nothing against the idea: heaven as a symbol or substitute of the Highest Being and Supreme Deity. Anyhow, practically every important author discovered some monotheistic elements in the RV., either in connection with the *ekam* (or *eka*) or with Dyauspitar and Varuṇa Asura.

4. The Upaniṣads.

Also in these works we meet an inclination to revere to an Ultimate Reality. The position of Brahman in Ch. Up. as well as BAU. is so prominent and moreover *the mentioning of devas is casual* and without any enthusiasm and lacking in reverence or worship. With the fear of those *devas* so far gone, Brahman is the only cause of everything, the only solution of every problem, cosmic as well as microcosmic. The authors of the Upanisads endeavour to stress this very point, that Brahman is the basis that supports everything and is the first Cause.

Oldenberg[4]) quotes: "Brahman wahrlich war dies (All) im Anfang. Das erschuf die Götter. Als es die Götter erschaffen, liesz es sie diese Welten besteigen... Das Brahman selbst aber ging zur jenseitigen Sphäre". S. Br. 11,2,3:.

So I may believe there is no reason for any doubt in concluding that the *devas* were never God par excellence to the Vedic Indian as far as the Vedic sources reveal them to us. Here one has to accept something like a Vacuum behind those "spirits" in our sense, without stressing the point that the *devas* are spiritual. They were powers and forces that were frightening to the Indian and at times benevolent to him. They occupied his mind virtually to the full. But at the back of his mind the Vedic Indian had still a doubt about the Ultimate Reality of the *devas* and a desire for something deeper, something like a First Cause. Or even more: an old feeling or reminiscence of bygone times about a Godhead or divinity that governed All and from whom everything comes forth into being.

[1]) RV. 2,38,10: 3,1,3: 4: 13: 3,2: 5: 4,1: 6,6: 13,1: 17,3: 20,5: 27,3: 33,6: 53,1: 54,17: 59,9: 4,8,3: 15,2: 30,24: 34,11: 47,1: 55,1: 5,2,11: 13,6: 17,1: 26,1: 29,9: 33,3: 42,17: 43,3: 45,1: 49,1: 2: 50,2: 5: 74,2: 81,1: 5: 82,1: 7: 6,16,7: 18,14: 47,28: 56,1: 73,2: 8,65,4: 83,1: 9,11,2: 7: 28,2: 80,4: 86,30: 106,6: 107,23: 109,21: 10,110,5: 159,5: 174,4: etc. etc.

[2]) R.V. 1,44,11: 12: 3,2,8: 9,9: 5,21,3: 6,16,1:.

[3]) RV. 1,1,1: 76,2: 4: 5: 3,10,7: 13,1: 5,4,3: 21,1: 26,4: 6,16,2: 10:.

[4]) "Godsdienst der Primitieven", Roermond, 1949; cf. also M. Eliade, "Traité d'histoire des religions", Paris, 1949, § 37.

[5]) J. Gonda, "Notes on Brahman", Utrecht, 1950, p. 32—38.

[6]) cf. 3,1,15: 5,6: 15,4: 62,3: 15: 4,18,8: 26,3: 41,2: 53,1: 54,3: 55,1: 5: 5,50,2: 7,60,8: 12: 8,64,9: cf. also 1,31,12: 89,1:.

[7]) cf. 6,11,6: 13,1: 16,31: 32: 18,14: 71,3: 10,137,5:.

[8]) cf. also 3,2,7: where Geldner translates "festhalten".

[9]) cf. RV. 1,14,1: 6: 22,9: 23,2: 10: 48,12: 92,18: 3,47,3: 53,10: 4,25,4: 46,7: 47,1: 5,51,3: 8: 7,98,3: 8,35,3: 9,23,6: 10,200,1: (Val. 9).

[10]) cf. J. McKenzie: "Hindu Ethics", London, 1922, and also E. W. Hopkins: "Ethics of India", New Haven, 1924; Farquhar: "Lectures on Comparative Religion", Oxford, ??, p. 66 ff.

[11]) cf. "The Bhagavad Gita", by Radhakrishnan, London, 1949, p. 136.

[12]) cf. also 2,3,4: 41,13: 3,4,8: 9,6: 43,3: 5,26,4: 5: 9: 51,1: 6,15,16: 16,41: 6,52,7: 17: 7,14,1: 3: 82,8: 8,35,3: 6: 24: 10,110,4:.

[13]) cf. also 1,39,7: 142,3: 9: 161,6: 162,4: 188,3: 2,3,1: 41,21: 3,4,8: 4,1,20: 15,1: 54,2: 56,2: 5,26,4: 6,1,4: 48,21: 50,8: 52,13: 17: 7,39,6:.

[14]) M. Muusses, "Koecultus bij de Hindoes", Diss. Utrecht, 1922.

[15]) cf. RV. 1,92,12: 5,80,3: 7,77,2: cf. also 1,124,5:.

[16]) cf. R.V. 1,153,3: 9,96,15: 10,11,1:.

[17]) H. von Glasenap, "Religionen Indiens", Stuttgart, 1943, p. 55.

[18]) J. Gonda, "Inleiding tot het Indische Denken", Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 1948, p. 19.

[19]) Masson-Ourssel, "Ancient India and Indian civilization", London, 1934, p. 79.

[20]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda", 4th ed., Stuttgart, 1923, p. 284.

[21]) cf. also 1,70,6: 71,3: 50,5: etc.

[22]) S. D. Atkins, "Pusan in the Rig Veda", Princeton, 1941, p. 29.

[23]) P. Thieme, "Studien zur Indogerm. Wortkunde und Religionsgesch.", Berlin, 1952.

[24]) in a conversation.

[25]) E. W. Hopkins, "Religions of India", p. 172.

[26]) "Inleiding tot het Ind. Denken", p. 60 vv.

[27]) cf. also 1,37,15: 44,6: 53,11: 73,5: 89,2: 8: 93,3: 94,16: 96,8: 116,10: 19: 25: 157,4: 2,32,1: 3,62,15: 4,12,6: 6,52,15: 7,77,5: 8,18,18: 22: 44,30: 8,48,4: 10: 79,6: 9,80,2: 96,14: 10,14,14: 18,2, 3: 36,14: 59,5: 62,11:.

[28]) J. Gonda, "Maya". Tijdschrift voor Philosophie. Leuven, 1952; cf. also P. D. Devanandan, "The concept of Maya", London, 1950.

[29]) cf. also: 1,27,2: 143,1: 3,11,4: 28,3: 6,5,1: 6,1: 12,1:.

[30]) Mounds in the Indus valley belonging to the ancient civilization show that the invaders burned the cities of a high culture.

[31]) cf. also: 3,6,6: 9: 19,4: 5,26,1. 7,11,1 .

[32]) cf. also 1,54,1: 57,5: 82,1: 3: 84,19: 102,3: 4. 7: 10: 103,2: 4: 104,5: 8: 132,1: 1,165,9: 171,3: 174,7: 178,3: and so throuth the entire RV.

[33]) cf. also: 1,31,3: 44,3: 45,10: 60,4: 79,5: 94,13: 127,1: 128,6: 143,1: 2,7,1: 3,6: 6,1,12: 16,18: 26: 48,9: 8,19,26: 28: 29: 10,8,4: 91,12:.

[36]) cf. also 1,29,1: 30,1: 2,13,13: 4,32,14: 6,46,8: 7,31,3: 4: 8,1,6: 29: 2,1: 8,21,8: 10,38,2:.

[37]) cf. also: 3,9,6: 4,1,1: 6,2: 6,5,3: 13,3: 7,4,4: 16,6: 37,5: 8,84,2: 10,79,4: 93,5: 97,9:.

[illegible] 9: 4,5: 6,21,12: 47,8: [illegible] 7,3: 28,5: 32,6: 52,4: [illegible]

[39]) A. A. Macdonell, in J.R.A.S. [illegible]

[40]) M. Müller in "Varuna und Mitra", in: Contributions to the science of Mythology, 2 (1897), p. 661—668.

[41]) K. Rönnow: "Trita Aptya", Upsala, diss. 1927.

[42]) cf. also: 4,1,7: 2,18: 17,2: 22,4: 27,1: 6,63,5: 7,42,2: 60,3: 9,68,5: 83,4: 9,97,7: 103,3: 10,89,3:.

[43]) cf. also: 6,11,3: 51,2: 12: 8,69,3: 9,108,8: 10,64,14:

[44]) cf. 1,11,4: 134,2: 51,11: 7,21,1: 9,8,5: 25,1: 62,20: 67,2: 16: 18:.

[45]) cf. also: 1,7,2: 5: 7: 40,8: 52,5: 57,6: 63,4: 5: 7: 80,7: 11: 1,103,3: 109,8: 130,3: 131,6: 173,10: 2,16,6: 19,2: etc. etc.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]) cf. also 11,6,3: 14,1,49: 18,1,36: 4,31: 19,10,10: 24,1: 49,1:.

[2]) In this context I should like to refer to Gonda's treatise "Utsava" in India Antiqua, p. 146 f., where the author proves the basic reason of Indian festivals to be magic "analogy" or magic "symbolism", demonstrating a primitive idea: [illegible] ...tions".

[3]) cf. also: 2,12,5: 13,1: 16,4: 17,7: 18,1: 19,1—5: 20,1: 21,1: 22,1: 25,1: 3,15,7: 17,4: 4,23,1: 38,6: 7: 5,3,2: 4: 7: 9: 18,1,34: 3,26—28: 4,9: cf. also 7,84,1: and 106,1:.

[7]) cf. also 7,9,2: 31,1: 84,1: 8,1,7: 11: 18: 5,14: 9,2,7: 13: 8,3,20: 10,1,21: 7,23: 11,1,37: 16,4,4: 18,1,34: 19,9,12: 16,1: 2: 17,1—10: 20,3: 55,1: 2: 7:.

[8]) cf. also 1,7,1: 6: 8,4: 5,6,5: 10: 6,6,1: 2: 50,1: 66,1: 2: 67,2: 6,75,1: 2: 7,79,2: 8,3,14: 18: 9,2,14: 11,1,2: 13,1,3: 14,2,24: 19,66,1: and also 3,10,12: 4,32,3: 6,32,1:.

[9]) "Ancient Indian Ojas" by Prof. J. Gonda, Utrecht, 1952, passim.

[10]) cf. also 5,8,9: 23,11: and with *ugratapas* 5,17,1: 6,74,3: 118,1: (*ugrajit*) 8,8,6—8: 15,5,4: 17,1,1: 18,3,54: 19,24,7:.

[11]) cf. also 3,3,3: 4,5: 4,16,2: 3,5: 5,19,10: 25,6: 6,20,2: 88,2: 7,83,1: 2: 9,2,6: 12,3,44: 13,6,2: 14,2,49: 15,2,17: 14,3: 18,4,70: 19,13,10: 26,4: 44,8:.

[12]) cf. Sten Rodhe, "Deliver us from evil". Studies on the vedic ideas of salvation, Lund, 1946.

[13]) cf. also 2,29,1: 2: 3,5,3: 4: 11,4: 8: 6,5,2: 41,3: 78,3: 122,4: 53,6: 89,2: 103,1: 8,1,7: 11: 15: 18: 27—9: 9,1,15: 14,2,36: 39: 75: 19,12,1: 26,4: 30,2: 43,7: 61,1: 63,1: 64,4: 73,1:.

[1]) RV. 2,38,10: 3,1,3: 4: 13: 3,2: 5: 4,1: 6,6: 13,1: 17,3: 20,5: 27,3: 33,6: 53,1: 54,17: 59,9: 4,8,3: 15,2: 30,24: 34,11: 47,1: 55,1: 5,2,11: 13,6: 17,1: 26,1: 29,9: 33,3: 42,17: 43,3: 45,1: 49,1: 2: 50,2: 5: 74,2: 81,1: 5: 82,1: 7: 6,16,7: 18,14: 47,28: 56,1: 73,2: 8,65,4: 83,1: 9,11,2: 7: 28,2: 80,4: 86,30: 106,6: 107,23: 109,21: 10,110,5: 159,5: 174,4: etc. etc.

[2]) R.V. 1,44,11: 12: 3,2,8: 9,9: 5,21,3: 6,16,1:.

[3]) RV. 1,1,1: 76,2: 4: 5: 3,10,7: 13,1: 5,4,3: 21,1: 26,4: 6,16,2: 10:.

[4]) "Godsdienst der Primitieven", Roermond, 1949; cf. also M. Eliade, "Traité d'histoire des religions", Paris, 1949, § 37.

[5]) J. Gonda, "Notes on Brahman", Utrecht, 1950, p. 32—38.

[6]) cf. 3,1,15: 5,6: 15,4: 62,3: 15: 4,18,8: 26,3: 41,2: 53,1: 54,3: 55,1: 5: 5,50,2: 7,60,8: 12: 8,64,9: cf. also 1,31,12: 89,1:.

[7]) cf. 6,11,6: 13,1: 16,31: 32: 18,14: 71,3: 10,137,5:.

[8]) cf. also 3,2,7: where Geldner translates "festhalten".

[9]) cf. RV. 1,14,1: 6: 22,9: 23,2: 10: 48,12: 92,18: 3,47,3: 53,10: 4,25,4: 46,7: 47,1: 5,51,3: 8: 7,98,3: 8,35,3: 9,23,6: 10,200,1: (Val. 9).

[10]) cf. J. McKenzie: "Hindu Ethics", London, 1922, and also E. W. Hopkins: "Ethics of India", New Haven, 1924; Farquhar: "Lectures on Comparative Religion", *Oxford, II, p. 66 ff.*

[11]) cf. "The Bhagavad Gita", by Radhakrishnan, London, 1949, p. 136.

[12]) cf. also 2,3,4: 41,13: 3,4,8: 9,6: 43,3: 5,26,4: 5: 9: 51,1: 6,15,16: 16,41: 6,52,7: 17: 7,14,1: 3: 82,8: 8,35,3: 6: 24: 10,110,4:.

[13]) *cf. also 1,39,7: 142,3: 9: 161,6: 162,4: 188,3·* 2,3,1: 41,21: 3,4,8: 4,1,20: 15,1: 54,2: 56,2: 5,26,4: 6,1,4: 48,21: 50,8: 52,13· 17: 7,39,6·.

[14]) M. Muusses, "Koecultus bij de Hindoes", Diss. Utrecht, 1922.

[15]) cf. RV. 1,92,12: 5,80,3: *7,77,2:* cf. also 1,124,5:.

[16]) *cf. R.V. 1,153,3: 9,96,15: 10,11,1:.*

[17]) H. von Glasenap, "Religionen Indiens", Stuttgart, 1943, p. 55.

[18]) J. Gonda, "Inleiding tot het Indische Denken", Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 1948, p. 19.

[19]) Masson-Oursel, "Ancient India and Indian civilization", London, 1934, p. 79.

[20]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda", 4th ed., Stuttgart, 1923, p. 284.

[21]) cf. also 1,70,6: 71,3: 50,5: etc.

[22]) S. D. Atkins, "Pusan in the Rig Veda", Princeton, 1941, p. 29.

[23]) P. Thieme, "Studien zur Indogerm. Wortkunde und Religionsgesch.", Berlin, 1952.

[24]) in a conversation.

[25]) E. W. Hopkins, "Religions of India", p. 172.

[26]) "Inleiding tot het Ind. Denken", p. *60 vv.*

[27]) *cf. also 1,37,15: 44,6·* 53,11· 73,5: 89,2· 8: 93,3: 94,16: 96,8: 116,10· 19: 25: 157,4: 2,32,1: 3,62,15: 4,12,6: 6,52,15 7,77,5: 8,18,18: 22: 44,30: 8,48,4: 10: 79,6: 9,80,2: 96,14: 10,14,14: 18,2: 3: 36,14 59,5: 62,11:.

[28]) J. Gonda, "Maya". Tijdschrift voor Philosophie, Leuven, 1952; cf. also P. D. Devanandan, "The concept of Maya", London, 1950.

[29]) cf. also: 1,27,2: 143,1: 3,11,4: 28,3 6,5,1: 6,1: 12,1:.

[30]) Mounds in the Indus valley belonging to the ancient civilization show that the invaders burned the cities of a high culture.

[31]) cf. also: 3,6,6: 9: 19,4· 5,26,1. 7,11,1:.

[32]) cf. also 1,54,1: 57,5: 82,1: 3: 84,19 102,3· 4: 7: 10: 103,2: 4: 104,5: 8: 132,1: 1,165,9: 171,3: 174,7: 178,5: and so through the entire RV.

[33]) cf. also: 1,31,3: 44,3: 45,10: 60,4: 79,5: 94,13: 127,1: 128,6: 143,1: 2,7,1: 5,6,1: 3,6: 6,1,12: 16,18: 26: 48,9: 8,19,26: 28: 29: 10,8,4: 91,12:.

[34]) cf. also 1,29,1: 30,1: 2,13,13: 4,32,14: 6,46,6: 7,31,3: 4: 8,1,6: 29: 2,1: 8,21,8: 10,38,2:.

[35]) cf. also: 3,9,6: 4,1,1: 6,2: 6,5,3: 13,3: 7,4,4: 16,6: 17,5: 8,84,2: 10,79,4: 83,5: 87,9:.

[36]) cf. 5,42,3: 85,6: 6,18,14: 7,86,7:.

[37]) cf. also: 2,5,8: 6,7: 8: 3,14,2: 4,1,4: 2,11: 8,4: 5,2,8: 3,9: 4,5: 6,21,12: 47,8: 7,7,1: 28,1: 8,63,3: 9,70,10: 73,8: 77,4: 10,2,3: 4: 10,5,5: 17,3: 28,5: 32,6: 52,4: 67,3: 70,10: 110,9: 139,1: 160,2:.

[38]) E. Hardy, "Die vedische-brahmanische Periode", 1893.

[39]) A. A. Macdonell, in J.R.A.S. 1893.

[40]) M. Müller in "Varuna und Mitra", in: Contributions to the science of Mythology, 2 (1897), p. 661—668.

[41]) K. Rönnow: "Trita Aptya", Upsala, diss. 1927.

[42]) cf. also: 4,1,7: 2,18: 17,2: 22,4: 27,1: 6,63,5: 7,42,2: 60,3: 9,68,5: 83,4: 9,97,7: 108,3: 10,89,3:.

[43]) cf. also: [illegible]

[44]) cf. 1,11,4: [illegible]

[45]) cf. also: [illegible] 130,3: 131,6: 175,10: 2,16,6: 19,2: etc. etc.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]) cf. also 11,6,3: [illegible]

[illegible] Am[illegible] to be [illegible] or magic "symbolism", demonstrating [illegible]

[illegible]

[4]) [illegible]

[5]) F[illegible] exampl[illegible] zwisch[illegible] für die [illegible] xater[illegible] einzige[illegible]

[6]) cf. also: 2,12,5: 13,1: 16,4: 17,7: 18,1: 19,1—5: 20,1: 21,1: 22,1: 23,1: 3,15,7: 17,4: 4,25,1: 38,6: 7: 5,3,2: 4: 7: 9: 18,1,34: 3,26—28: 4,9: cf. also 7,84,1: and 106,1:.

[7]) [illegible]

[illegible] Ancient Indian Ojas" by Prof. J. Gonda, Utrecht, 1952, passim.

[10]) cf. also 5,8,9: 21,11: and with ugrataspas 5,17,1: 6,74,3: 118,1: (ugrajit) 8,8,6—8: 15,5,4: 17,1,5: 18,3,34: 19,24,7:.

[11]) cf. also 3,3,3: 4,5: 4,16,2. 5,5: 5,19,10: 25,6: 6,20,2: 83,2: 7,83,1: 2: 9,2,6: 12,5,44: 11,6,2: 14,2,49: 15,2,17: 14,3: 18,4,70: 19,13,10: 26,4: 44,8:.

[12]) cf. Sten Rodhe, "Deliver us from evil". Studies on the vedic ideas of salvation, Lund. 1946.

[13]) cf. also 2,29,1 2: 3,5,3: 4: 11,4: 8: 6,5,2: 41,3: 78,3: 121,4: 33,6: 89,2: 103,1: 8,1,7: 11: 35: 18: 27—9: 9,1,35: 14,2,36: 39: 75: 19,12,1: 26,4: 30,2: 43,7: 61,1: 63,1: 64,4: 72,1:.

[14]) For further reference: V. Henry, "La magie dans l'Inde antique"; H. Zimmer, "Hindu Medicine", Zürich 1951; M. Bloomfield, "Atharvaveda", Strassbourg, 1899.

[15]) B. A. G. Vroklage SVD., "Godsdienst der Primitieven", Roermond, 1949, p. *298.*

[16]) Leopold von Schröder, "Arische Religion", I, p. 393.

[17]) A. A. Macdonell, "Vedic Mythology", Strassbourg, 1897, p. 16.

[18]) George Dumézil, "Les dieux des Indo-Européens", Paris, 1952, p. 7—13;

[19]) Majumdar, Raychaudhuri, Kalikinkar Datta, "An advanced History of India", 2nd ed., London, 1950, p. 37.

[20]) H. Jacobi, "

[21]) M. Bloomfie

[22]) L. Barnett, '

[23]) A. B. Keith, "Indian Mythology", Boston, 1932, p. 61.

[24]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda", Stuttgart, 1923, p. 39.

[25]) Arbman, "Rudra", Upsala, 1922, p. 149.

[26]) H. von Glasenapp, "Religionen Indiens", Stuttgart, 1943, p. 40.

[27]) S. Radhakrishnan, "Indian Philosophy", I, London, 1948, p. 72, 73.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1]) cf. P. Br. 1,4,1: 5,4,6: 5,1: 7,1: 6,5,5: 7: 8: 10: 6,8: 7,5: 6: 7,2,1: 5,20: 9,16: 10,10: 9,2,3: 14,8,6: 9,10: etc.; cf. also J. Up. Br. 1,8,7: 52,1: 55,4: 58,8: 10: 59,12: 3,5,5: 20,1: 21,3: 26,5: 32,1: 6: 4,6,5: 7,3: 19,1:.

[2]) P. Br. 2,6,2: 7,2: 12,2: 15,2: 3,2,2: 5,2: 4,2,2: 3,2: 7,4,2: 7: 7,17: 8,2,6: 3,5: 5,7: 8,13: 9,15: 9,2,9: 11,10,21: 12,12,10: 14,3,24: 5,17: 9,40: 15,3,36: 5,11: 11,5: 16,11,9: 12,7: 14,4: 17,1,1: 13,18: 20,1,3: 11,3: 21,8,2: 23,19,2: 25,1,3: 2,2: 16,2:.

[3]) P. Br. 5,5,15: 8,4,6: 6,5: 6: 9,2: 15: 9,2,11: 11,5,9: 12,3,14: 9,21: 13,6,7: 16,2,2: 3: 3,2: 20,6,1c: 8,1c: 22,14,2: 5:; J. Br. §§ 20: 23: 32: 34: 46: 47: 63: 78: 81: 96: 165: 191:; J. Up. Br. 1,16,1: 60,1: etc. 2,3,4: 11: 8,4:: 10,1:.

[4]) P. Br. 18,6,4: 7,5: 19,13,4: 22,5,5: 8: 7,8: 11,3: 22,18,5: 23,6,2: 5: 25,5,2: 25,6,2: 9,2:.

[5]) P. Br. 6,3,9: 7,8,14: 10,13: 15: 9,6,7: 10,2,1: 11,3,5: 15,8,2: 16,4,1: 5,23: 17,10,2: 20,4,5: 21,2,1: 22,5,3: 23,9,2: 24,1,2: 11,2:; J. Br. §§ 9: 71: 133: 139: 166:; J. Up. Br. 1,11,1: 1,24,3: 46,1:.

[6]) P. Br. 12,1,4: 20,14,2: 7: (Vac); J. Br. §§ 8: 99: 141:; J. Up. Br. 1,18,1: 24,4:.

[7]) *P. Br. 9,1,35: 15,5,35: 20,3,2: 21,1,10:; J. Br. § 8: 41:.*

[8]) Prajapati created the hymns and metres: P. Br. 7,8,9—14: J. Br. § 25. He created the sacrifice: P. Br. 8,6,3:; J. Br. § 105: 211:. He created mankind: P. Br. 22,9,2: J. Br. § 8:.

[9]) J. Masson SJ., "*La religion populaire dans le canon Bouddhique Pali*", Louvain 1942.

[10]) E. W. Hopkins, "Gods and Saints in the Great Brahmana". Trans. Conn. Acad. 15 (1908), p. 23 en 37.

[11]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Lehre der Upanisaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus", Göttingen, 1923, p. 14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1]) *cf.* Emile Senart, "Brhad Aranyaka Upanisad", Paris, 1934, p. 21.

S. Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", London, 1953, p. 180: "As is this divinity (Hiranyagarbha) so is he. As all beings regard that divinity, so do all beings regard him who knows this". And Radhakrishnan gives an explanation: "Individuals suffer because one causes suffering to another, but in the *Universal* Spirit where all individuals are one, the sufferings of the individuals do not *affect* the whole".

2) "Indian Philosophy" by S. Radhakrishnan, London, 1948, I, p. 99—104.

3) cf. Senart, o.c., p. 12. Radhakrishnan, "The principal Upanisads", p. 168, gives a somewhat identical rendering: "I am Brahman. *Therefore it* became all. Even the gods cannot prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self"; cf. also Hume, "The thirteen principal Upanisads", Oxford, 1949: "Even the gods have no power to prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self", p. 84.

4) Maryla Falk, "Nama Rupa", Calcutta, 1943.

5) S. Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", p. 277. Senart renders: "Les dieux le connaissent pour la lumière des lumières. Ils le connaissent pour la vie immortelle", p. 82 of his BAU.-edition.

6) Hume, o.c., p. 85: "So amongst the gods Brahma appeared by means of Agni".

7) Max Müller, "The Upanisads", Oxford, 1926, p. 90: "Among the devas that Brahman existed as Agni (fire) only . . ."

8) Hume, o.c., p. 183, renders: "now with reference to the divinities". — Müller, o.c., p. 7: "now follows the meditation on the udgitha with reference to the gods". — Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", p. 342: "now with reference to the divinities".

9) Hume, o.c., p. 92.

10) Radhakrishnan, o.c., p. 180: "As all beings regard that divinity, so do all beings regard him, who knows this", and then he renders our quotation: "As is this divinity (Hiranya-garbha) so is he." — Max Müller, in SBE., vol. 40, p. 97, also inserts Hiranya-garbha.

11) Hume, o.c., p. 216.

12) S. Rodhe, "Deliver us from evil", Lund, 1946, p. 170: "For the evil works that are mentioned now *and then in the Upanisads the typical words for sin*, met with in the ritual texts: *enas*, *agas*, etc. are not used. In he Upanisads *enas* appears only when RV. 1,189,1: is quoted in BAU. 5,15,1: and in Isa Up. 18:.

13) Radhakrishnan, o.c., p. 172.

14) About amrta cf. P. Thieme: "Studien zur Indogerm. Wortkunde u. Religionsgeschichte", Berlin, 1952.

15) cf. E. Senart, p. 49.

[14]) For further reference: V. Henry, "La magie dans l'Inde antique"; H. Zimmer, "Hindu Medicine", Zürich 1951; M. Bloomfield, "Atharvaveda", Strasbourg, 1899.
[15]) B. A. G. Vroklage SVD., "Godsdienst der Primitieven", Roermond, 1949, p. 298.
[16]) Leopold von Schröder, "Arische Religion", I, p. 393.
[17]) A. A. Macdonell, "Vedic Mythology", Strassbourg, 1897, p. 16.
[18]) George Dumézil, "Les dieux des Indo-Européens", Paris, 1952, p. 7—13;
[19]) Majumdar, Raychaudhuri, Kalikinkar Datta, "An advanced History of India", 2nd ed., London, 1950, p. 37.
[20]) H. Jacobi, "Die Entwicklung des Indischen Gottesbegriff", p. 1.
[21]) M. Bloomfield, "Religion of the Veda", New York, 1908, p. 151.
[22]) L. Barnett, "Hindu Gods and Heroes", London, 1922, p. 13.
[23]) A. B. Keith, "Indian Mythology", Boston, 1932, p. 61.
[24]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda", Stuttgart, 1923, p. 39.
[25]) Arbman, "Rudra", Upsala, 1922, p. 149.
[26]) H. von Glasenapp, "*Religionen Indiens*", Stuttgart, 1943, p. 40.
[27]) S. Radhakrishnan, "Indian Philosophy", I, London, 1948, p. 72, 73.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1])cf. P. Br. 1,4,1: 5,4,6: 5,1: 7,1: 6,5,5: 7: 8: 10: 6,8: 7,5: 6: 7,2,1: 5,20: 9,16: 10,10: 9,2,3: 14,8,6: 9,10: etc.; cf. also J. Up. Br. 1,8,7: 52,1: 55,4: 58,8: 10: 59,12: 3,5,5: 20,1: 21,3: 26,5: 32,1: 6: 4,6,5: 7,3: 19,1:.
[2]) P. Br. 2,6,2: 7,2: 12,2: 15,2: 3,2,2: 5,2: 4,2,2: 3,2: 7,4,2: 7: 7,17: 8,2,6: 3,5: 5,7: 8,13: 9,15: 9,2,9: 11,10,21: 12,12,10: 14,3,24: 5,17: 9,40: 15,3,36: 5,11: 11,5: 16,11,9: 12,7: 14,4: 17,1,1: 13,18: 20,1,3: 11,3: 21,8,2: 23,19,2: 25,1,3: 2,2: 16,2:.
[3]) P. Br. 5,5,15: 8,4,6: 6,5: 6: 9,2: 15: 9,2,11: 11,5,9: 12,3,14: 9,21: 13,6,7: 16,2,2: 3: 3,2: 20,6,1c: 8,1c: 22,14,2: 5:; J. Br. §§ 20: 23: 32: 34: 46: 47: 63: 78: 81: 96: 165: 191:; J. Up. Br. 1,16,1: 60,1: etc. 2,3,4: 11: 8,4:: 10,1:.
[4]) P. Br. 18,6,4: 7,5: 19,13,4: 22,5,5: 8: 7,8: 11,3: 22,18,5: 23,6,2: 5: 25,5,2: 25,6,2: 9,2:.
[5]) P. Br. 6,3,9: 7,8,14: 10,13: 15: 9,6,7: 10,2,1: 11,3,5: 15,8,2: 16,4,1: 5,23: 17,10,2: 20,4,5: 21,2,1: 22,5,3: 23,9,2: 24,1,2: 11,2:; J. Br. §§ 9: 71: 133: 139: 166:; J. Up. Br. 1,11,1: 1,24,3: 46,1:.
[6]) P. Br. 12,1,4: 20,14,2: 7: (Vac); J. Br. §§ 8: 99: 141:; J. Up. Br. 1,18,1: 24,4:.
[7]) P. Br. 9,1,35: 15,5,35: 20,3,2: 21,1,10:; J. Br. § 8: 41:.
[8]) Prajapati created the hymns and metres: P. Br. 7,8,9—14: J. Br. § 25. He created the sacrifice: P. Br. 8,6,3:; J. Br. § 108: 211:. He created mankind: P. Br. 22,9,2: J. Br. § 8:.
[9]) J. Masson SJ., "*La religion populaire dans le canon Bouddhique Pali*", Louvain 1942.
[10]) E. W. Hopkins, "Gods and Saints in the Great Brahmana". Trans. Conn. Acad. 15 (1908), p. 23 en 37.
[11]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Lehre der *Upanisaden* und die *Anfänge des Buddhismus*", Göttingen, 1923, p. 14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1]) cf. Emile Senart, "Brhad Aranyaka Upanisad", Paris, 1934, p. 21.
S. Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", London, 1953, p. 183: "As is this divinity (*Hiranyagarbha*) so is he. As all beings regard that divinity, so do all beings regard him who knows this". And Radhakrishnan gives an explanation: "Individuals suffer because one causes suffering to another, but in the Universal Spirit where all individuals are one, the sufferings of the individuals do not affect the whole".

2) "Indian Philosophy" by S. Radhakrishnan, London, 1948, I, p. 99—104.

3) cf. Senart, o.c., p. 12. Radhakrishnan, "The principal Upanisads", p. 168, gives a somewhat identical rendering: "I am Brahman. Therefore it became all. Even the gods cannot prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self"; cf. also Hume, "The thirteen principal Upanisads", Oxford, 1949: "Even the gods have no power to prevent his becoming thus, for he becomes their self", p. 84.

4) Maryla Falk, "Nama Rupa", Calcutta, 1943.

5) S. Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", p. 277. Senart renders: "Les dieux le connaissent pour la lumière des lumières. Ils le connaissent pour la vie immortelle", p. 82 of his BAU.-edition.

6) Hume, o.c., p. 85: "So amongst the gods Brahma appeared by means of Agni".

7) Max Müller, "The Upanisads", Oxford, 1926, p. 90: "Among the devas that Brahman existed as Agni (fire) only . . ."

8) Hume, o.c., p. 180, renders: "now with reference to the divinities". — Müller, o.c., p. 7: "now follows the meditation on the udgitha with reference to the gods". — Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", p. 342: "now with reference to the divinities".

9) Hume, o.c., p. 90.

10) Radhakrishnan, o.c., p. 180: "As all beings regard that divinity, so do all beings regard him, who knows this", and then he renders our quotation: "As is this divinity (Hiranya-garbha) so is he." — Max Müller, in SBE., vol. 40, p. 97, also inserts Hiranya-garbha.

11) Hume, o.c., p. 216.

12) S. Rodhe, "Deliver us from evil", Lund, 1946, p. 170: "For the evil works that are mentioned now and then in the Upanisads the typical words for sin, met with in the ritual texts: *enas*, *agas*, etc. are not used. In he Upanisads *enas* appears only when RV. 1,189,1: is quoted in BAU. 5,15,1: and in Isa Up. 18:.

13) Radhakrishnan, o.c., p. 172.

14) About amrta cf. P. Thieme: "Studien zur Indogerm. Wortkunde u. Religionsgeschichte", Berlin, 1952.

15) cf. E. Senart, p. 49.

[14]) For further reference: V. Henry, "La magie dans l'Inde antique"; H. Zimmer, "Hindu Medicine", Zürich 1951; M. Bloomfield, "Atharvaveda", Strassbourg, 1899.

[15]) B. A. G. Vroklage SVD., "Godsdienst der Primitieven", Roermond, 1949, p. 298.

[16]) Leopold von Schröder, "Arische Religion", I, p. 390.

[17]) A. A. Macdonell, "Vedic Mythology", Strassbourg, 1897, p. 16.

[18]) George Dumézil, "Les dieux des Indo-Européens", Paris, 1952, p. 7—11;

[19]) Majumdar, Raychaudhuri, Kalikinkar Datta, "An advanced History of India", 2nd ed., London, 1950, p. 37.

[20]) H. Jacobi, "Die Entwicklung des Indischen Gottesbegriff", p. 1.

[21]) M. Bloomfield, "Religion of the Veda", New York, 1908, p. 151.

[22]) L. Barnett, "Hindu Gods and Heroes", London, 1922, p. 13.

[23]) A. B. Keith, "Indian Mythology", Boston, 1932, p. 61.

[24]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda", Stuttgart, 1923, p. 39.

[25]) Arbman, "Rudra", Upsala, 1922, p. 149.

[26]) H. von Glasenapp, "Religionen Indiens", Stuttgart, 1943, p. 40.

[27]) S. Radhakrishnan, "Indian Philosophy", I, London, 1948, p. 72, 73.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1])cf. P. Br. 1,4,1: 5,4,6: 5,1: 7,1: 6,5,5: 7: 8: 10: 6,8: 7,5: 6: 7,2,1: 5,20: 9,16: 10,10: 9,2,3: 14,8,6: 9,10: etc.; cf. also J. Up. Br. 1,8,7: 52,1: 55,4: 58,8: 10: 59,12: 3,5,5: 20,1: 21,3: 26,5: 32,1: 6: 4,6,5: 7,3: 19,1:.

[2]) P. Br. 2,6,2: 7,2: 12,2: 15,2: 3,2,2: 5,2: 4,2,2: 3,2: 7,4,2: 7: 7,17: 6,2,6: 3,5: 5,7: 8,13: 9,15: 9,2,9: 11,10,21: 12,12,10: 14,3,24: 5,17: 9,40: 15,3,36: 5,11: 11,5: 16,11,9: 12,7: 14,4: 17,1,1: 13,18: 20,1,3: 11,3: 21,8,2: 23,19,2: 25,1,3: 2,2: 16,2:.

[3]) P. Br. 5,5,15: 8,4,6: 6,5: 6: 9,2: 15: 9,2,11: 11,5,9: 12,3,14: 9,21: 13,6,7: 16,2,2: 3: 3,2: 20,6,1c: 8,1c: 22,14,2: 5:; J. Br. §§ 20: 23: 32: 34: 46: 47: 63: 78: 81: 96: 165: 191:; J. Up. Br. 1,16,1: 60,1: etc. 2,3,4: 11: 8,4:: 10,1:.

[4]) P. Br. 18,6,4: 7,5: 19,13,4: 22,5,5: 8: 7,8: 11,3: 22,18,5: 23,6,2: 5: 25,5,2: 25,6,2: 9,2:.

[5]) P. Br. 6,3,9: 7,8,14: 10,13: 15: 9,6,7: 10,2,1: 11,3,5: 15,8,2: 16,4,1: 5,23: 17,10,2: 20,4,5: 21,2,1: 22,5,3: 23,9,2: 24,1,2: 11,2:; J. Br. §§ 9: 71: 133: 139: 166:; J. Up. Br. 1,11,1: 1,24,3: 46,1:.

[6]) P. Br. 12,1,4: 20,14,2: 7: (Vac); J. Br. §§ 8: 99: 141:; J. Up. Br. 1,18,1: 24,4:.

[7]) P. Br. 9,1,35: 15,5,35: 20,3,2: 21,1,10:; J. Br. § 8: 41:.

[8]) *Prajapati created the hymns and metres:* P. Br. 7,8,9—14: J. Br. § 25. *He created the sacrifice:* P. Br. 8,6,3:; J. Br. § 108: 211:. *He created mankind:* P. Br. 22,9,2: J. Br. § 8:.

[9]) J. Mason SJ., "La religion populaire dans le canon Bouddhique Pali", Louvain 1942.

[10]) E. W. Hopkins, "Gods and Saints in the Great Brahmana". Trans. Conn. Acad. 15 (1908), p. 23 en 37.

[11]) H. Oldenberg, "Die Lehre der Upanisaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus", Göttingen, 1923, p. 14.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1]) cf. Emile Senart, "Brhad Aranyaka Upanisad", Paris, 1934, p. 21.
S. Radhakrishnan, "The Principal Upanisads", London, 1953, p. 180: "*As is this divinity (Hiranyagarbha) so is he. As all beings regard that divinity, so do all beings regard him who knows this*". And Radhakrishnan gives an explanation: "*Individuals suffer because one causes suffering to another, but in the Universal Spirit where all individuals are one, the sufferings of the individuals do not affect the whole*".

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
— Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle, 1940.
J. Gonda, Ancient Indian Ojas. Utrecht, 1952.
— Het Boeddhisme. Den Haag, 1943.
— Inleiding tot het Indische Denken. Nijmegen—Antwerpen, 1948.
— Māyā, in: Tijdschrift voor Philosophie. Leuven, 1952.
— Notes on Brahman. Utrecht, 1950.
— Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. Leiden, 1951.
— Utsava, in: India Antiqua. Festschrift Vogel. Leiden, 1947.
— De Vedische Godsdienst. Den Haag, 1943.
— Aspects of early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht, 1954.
H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig, 1873.
E. Hardy, Die vedische-brahmanische Periode. Münster in W., 1893.
V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde Antique. Paris, 1904.
Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 12.
A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie. 3 Bde. Breslau 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. Strassburg, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
A. B. Keith, Indian Mythology. Boston, 1932.
— The Age of the Rigveda. Cambridge, 1922.
F. König, Christus und die Religionen der Erde. 3 Bde. Wien, 1951.
F. B. J. Kuiper, De Goddelijke Moeder in de Voorindische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuna I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— Lectures on comparative Religion. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1950.
G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. VEDIC TEXTS

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, edited by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney, Berlin 1856; 2nd edition by M. Lindenau, Berlin 1924.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Samskrit series 15. Poona 1891.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, text and translation by Emile Senart.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Samskrit series 14, Poona 1890.

Rigveda saṃhitā by A. Aufrecht. Berlin 1863.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by A. Weber. The White Yajurveda II. Berlin 1855 (1924).

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa.

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, translation by Dr. W. Caland, Calcutta 1931.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl by W. Caland, Amsterdam 1919.

II. MODERN AUTHORS

E. Arbman, Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Upsala, 1922.

S. D. Atkins, Pūṣan in the Rigveda. Princeton, 1941.

L. Barnett, Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.

K. L. Bellon, Inleiding tot de natuurlijke godsdienstwetenschap. Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 3e uitg., 1948.

A. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique d'après les Hymnes du Rigveda. 3 vol. Paris 1878—1883.

A. Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch. Tübingen, 1908.

M. Bloomfield, Rigveda repetitions. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

— Atharvaveda. Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 2, 1b. Strassburg, 1899.

— Atharvaveda. Hymns of the Atharvaveda. S.B.E., vol 42. Oxford 1897.

— The religion of the Veda. New York, 1908.

— A Vedic concordance. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

G. H. Th. Buschan, *Illustrierte Völkerkunde. 3 vol., 1922—26.*

P. von Bradke, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asura. 1855.

R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch. Indogerm. Bibl. III, 16. Heidelberg, 1938.

P. D. Devanandan, The Concept of Māyā. London, 1950.

G. Dumézil, Mitra Varuṇa. Essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la Souveraineté. Paris, 1948.

— Les dieux des Indo-Européens. Paris, 1952.

M. Falk, Nāmarūpa and Dharmarūpa. Calcutta, 1943.

J. N. Farquhar, Outline of the religious literature of India. Oxford, 1920.

K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. 3 Bde.

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
— Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle, 1940.
J. Gonda, Ancient Indian Ojas. Utrecht, 1952.
— Het Boeddhisme. Den Haag, 1943.
— Inleiding tot het Indische Denken. Nijmegen—Antwerpen, 1948.
— Māyā, in: Tijdschrift voor Philosophie. Leuven, 1952.
— Notes on Brahman. Utrecht, 1950.
— Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. Leiden, 1951.
— Utsava, in: India Antiqua. Festschrift Vogel. Leiden, 1947.
— De Vedische Godsdienst. Den Haag, 1943.
— Aspects of early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht, 1954.
H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig, 1873.
E. Hardy, Die vedische-brahmanische Periode. Münster in W., 1893.
V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde Antique. Paris, 1904.
Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 12.
A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie. 3 Bde. Breslau 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. Strassburg, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
A. B. Keith, Indian Mythology. Boston, 1932.
— The Age of the Rigveda. Cambridge, 1922.
F. König, Christus und die Religionen der Erde. 3 Bde. Wien, 1951.
F. B. J. Kuiper, De Goddelijke Moeder in de Voorindische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuṇa I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— Lectures on comparative Religion. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1953.
G. P. *Malalasekera*, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. VEDIC TEXTS

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, edited by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney, Berlin 1856; 2nd edition by *M. Lindenau*, Berlin 1924.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 15. Poona 1891.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, text and translation by Emile Senart.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 14, Poona 1890.

Rigveda saṃhitā by A. Aufrecht. Berlin 1863.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by A. Weber. The White *Yajurveda II.* Berlin 1855 (1924).

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa.

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, translation by Dr. W. Caland, Calcutta 1931.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl by W. Caland, Amsterdam 1919.

II. MODERN AUTHORS

E. Arbman, Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Upsala, 1922.

S. D. Atkins, Pūṣan in the Rigveda. Princeton, 1941.

L. Barnett, Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.

K. L. Bellon, Inleiding tot de natuurlijke godsdienstwetenschap. Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 3e uitg., 1948.

A. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique d'après les Hymnes du Rigveda. 3 vol. Paris 1878—1883.

A. Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch. Tübingen, 1908.

M. Bloomfield, Rigveda repetitions. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

— Atharvaveda. *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie* und Altertumskunde 2, 1b. Strassburg, 1899.

— Atharvaveda. Hymns of the Atharvaveda. S.B.E., vol 42. Oxford 1897.

— The religion of the Veda. New York, 1908.

— A Vedic concordance. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

G. H. Th. Buschan, Illustrierte Völkerkunde. 3 vol., 1922—26.

P. von Bradke, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asura. 1885.

R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch. Indogerm. Bibl. III, 16. Heidelberg, 1938.

P. D. Devanandan, The Concept of Māyā. *London*, 1950.

G. *Dumézil*, Mitra Varuṇa. Essai sur deux représentations indo-euro[illegible] 1948.

[illegible] 1952.

[illegible] alcutta, 1943.

[illegible] *literature of India. Oxford*, 1920.

K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. 3 Bde.

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
— Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle, 1940.
J. Gonda, Ancient Indian Ojas. Utrecht, 1952.
— Het Boeddhisme. Den Haag, 1943.
— Inleiding tot het Indische Denken. Nijmegen—Antwerpen, 1948.
— Māyā, in: Tijdschrift voor Philosophie. Leuven, 1952.
— Notes on Brahman. Utrecht, 1950.
— Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. Leiden, 1951.
— Utsava, in: India Antiqua. Festschrift Vogel. Leiden, 1947.
— De Vedische Godsdienst. Den Haag, 1943.
— Aspects of early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht, 1954.
H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig, 1873.
E. Hardy, Die vedische-brahmanische Periode. Münster in W., 1893.
V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde Antique. Paris, 1904.
Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 12.
A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie. 3 Bde. Breslau 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. Strassburg, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
A. B. Keith, Indian Mythology. Boston, 1932.
— The Age of the Rigveda. Cambridge, 1922.
F. König, Christus und die Religionen der Erde. 3 Bde. Wien, 1951.
F. B. J. Kuiper, De Goddelijke Moeder in de Voorindische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuna I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— Lectures on comparative Religion. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1950.
G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. VEDIC TEXTS

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, edited by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney, Berlin 1856; 2nd edition by M. Lindenau, Berlin 1924.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 15, Poona 1891.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, text and translation by Emile Senart.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 14, Poona 1890.

Rigveda saṃhitā by A. Aufrecht, Berlin 1863.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by A. Weber. The White Yajurveda II. Berlin 1855 (1924).

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa.

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, *translation by Dr. W. Caland, Calcutta 1931.*

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl by W. Caland, Amsterdam 1919.

II. MODERN AUTHORS

E. Arbman, Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Upsala, 1922.

S. D. Atkins, Pūṣan in the Rigveda. Princeton, 1941.

L. Barnett, Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.

K. L. Bellon, Inleiding tot de natuurlijke godsdienstwetenschap. Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 3e uitg., 1948.

A. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique d'après les Hymnes du Rigveda. 3 vol. Paris 1878—1883.

A. Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch. Tübingen, 1908.

M. Bloomfield, Rigveda repetitions. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

— Atharvaveda. Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 2, 1b. Strassburg, 1899.

— Atharvaveda. Hymns of the Atharvaveda. S.B.E., vol 42. Oxford 1897.

— The religion of the Veda. New York, 1908.

— A Vedic concordance. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

G. H. Th. Buschan, Illustrierte Völkerkunde. 3 vol., 1922—26.

P. von Bradke, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asura. 1855.

R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch. Indogerm. Bibl. III, 16. Heidelberg, 1938.

P. D. Devanandan, The Concept of Māyā. London, 1950.

G. Dumézil, Mitra Varuṇa. Essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la Souveraineté. Paris, 1948.

— *Les dieux des Indo-Européens*. Paris, 1952.

M. Falk, Nāmarūpa and Dharmarūpa. Calcutta, 1943.

J. N. Farquhar, Outline of the religious literature of India. Oxford, 1920.

K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. 3 Bde.

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
— Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle, 1940.
J. Gonda, Ancient Indian Ojas. Utrecht, 1952.
— Het Boeddhisme. Den Haag, 1943.
— Inleiding tot het Indische Denken. Nijmegen—Antwerpen, 1948.
— Māyā, *in: Tijdschrift voor Philosophie*. Leuven, 1952.
— Notes on Brahman. Utrecht, 1950.
— Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. Leiden, 1951.
— Utsava, in: India Antiqua. Festschrift Vogel. Leiden, 1947.
— *De Vedische Godsdienst*. Den Haag, 1943.
— Aspects of early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht, 1954.
H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig, 1873.
E. Hardy, Die vedische-brahmanische Periode. Münster in W., 1893.
V. Henry, *La magie dans l'Inde Antique*. Paris, 1904.
Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 12.
A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie. 3 Bde. Breslau 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. *Strassburg*, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
A. B. Keith, Indian Mythology. Boston, 1932.
— The Age of the Rigveda. Cambridge, 1922.
F. König, *Christus und die Religionen der Erde*. 3 Bde. Wien, 1951.
F. B. J. Kuiper, De Goddelijke Moeder in de Voorindische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuna I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— *Lectures on comparative Religion*. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1950.
G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. VEDIC TEXTS

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, edited by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney, Berlin 1856; 2nd edition by M. Lindenau, Berlin 1924.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 15. Poona 1891.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, text and translation by Emile Senart.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 14, Poona 1890.

Rigveda saṃhitā by A. Aufrecht. Berlin 1863.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by A. Weber. The White Yajurveda II. Berlin 1855 (1924).

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa.

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, translation by Dr. W. Caland, Calcutta 1931.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl by W. Caland, Amsterdam 1919.

II. MODERN AUTHORS

E. Arbman, Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Upsala, 1922.

S. D. Atkins, Pūṣan in the Rigveda. Princeton, 1941.

L. Barnett, Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.

[illegible] godsdienstwetenschap. Ant- [illegible]

[illegible] mnes du Rigveda. 3 vol. Paris 1878—1883.

A. Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch. Tübingen, 1908.

M. Bloomfield, Rigveda repetitions. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

— Atharvaveda. Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 2, 1b. Strassburg, 1899.

— Atharvaveda. Hymns of the Atharvaveda. S.B.E., vol 42. Oxford 1897.

— The religion of the Veda. New York, 1908.

— A Vedic concordance. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

G. H. Th. Butchan, Illustrierte Völkerkunde. 3 vol., 1922—26.

P. von Bradke, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asura. 1885.

R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch. Indogerm. Bibl. *III, 16. Heidelberg*, 1938.

P. D. Devanandan, The Concept of Māyā. London, 1950.

G. Dumézil, Mitra Varuṇa. Essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la Souveraineté. Paris, 1948.

— Les dieux des Indo-Européens. *Paris, 1952.*

M. Falk, Nāmarūpa and Dharmarūpa. Calcutta, *1943.*

J. N. Farquhar, Outline of the religious literature of India. *Oxford*, 1920.

K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. 3 Bde.

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
— Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle, 1940.
J. Gonda, Ancient Indian Ojas. Utrecht, 1952.
— Het Boeddhisme. Den Haag, 1943.
— Inleiding tot het Indische Denken. Nijmegen—Antwerpen, 1948.
— Māyā, in: Tijdschrift voor Philosophie. Leuven, 1952.
— Notes on Brahman. Utrecht, 1950.
— Remarks on the Sanskrit Passive. Leiden, 1951.
— Utsava, in: India Antiqua. Festschrift Vogel. Leiden, 1947.
— De Vedische Godsdienst. Den Haag, 1943.
— Aspects of early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht, 1954.
H. Grassmann, Wörterbuch zum Rigveda. Leipzig, 1873.
E. Hardy, Die vedische-brahmanische Periode. Münster in W., 1893.
V. Henry, La magie dans l'Inde Antique. Paris, 1904.
Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 12.
A. Hillebrandt, Vedische Mythologie. 3 Bde. Breslau 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. Strassburg, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
A. B. Keith, Indian Mythology. Boston, 1932.
— The Age of the Rigveda. Cambridge, 1922.
F. König, Christus und die Religionen der Erde. 3 Bde. Wien, 1951.
F. B. J. Kuiper, De Goddelijke Moeder in de Voorindische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuna I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— Lectures on comparative Religion. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1950.
G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. VEDIC TEXTS

Atharvaveda Saṃhitā, edited by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney, Berlin 1856; 2nd edition by M. Lindenau, Berlin 1924.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 15. Poona 1891.

Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, text and translation by Emile Senart.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the bhāṣya of Saṃkara. Anandasrama Saṃskrit series 14, Poona 1890.

Rigveda saṃhitā by A. Aufrecht. Berlin 1863.

Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. by A. Weber. The White Yajurveda II. Berlin 1855 (1924).

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa.

Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, translation by Dr. W. Caland, Calcutta 1931.

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl by W. Caland, Amsterdam 1919.

II. MODERN AUTHORS

E. Arbman, Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Upsala, 1922.

S. D. Atkins, Pūṣan in the Rigveda. Princeton, 1941.

L. Barnett, Hindu Gods and Heroes. London, 1922.

K. L. Bellon, Inleiding tot de natuurlijke godsdienstwetenschap. Antwerpen—Nijmegen, 3e uitg., 1948.

A. Bergaigne, La Religion Védique d'après les Hymnes du Rigveda. 3 vol. Paris 1878—1883.

A. Bertholet, Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch. Tübingen, 1908.

M. Bloomfield, Rigveda repetitions. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

— Atharvaveda. Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 2, 1b. Strassburg, 1899.

— Atharvaveda. Hymns of the Atharvaveda. S.B.E., vol 42. Oxford 1897.

— The religion of the Veda. New York, 1908.

— A Vedic concordance. Cambridge (Mass.), 1906.

G. H. Th. Buschan, Illustrierte Volkerkunde. 3 vol., 1922—26.

P. von Bradke, Dyaus Asura, Ahura Mazda und die Asura. 1885.

R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch. Indogerm. Bibl. III, 16. Heidelberg, 1938.

P. D. Devanandan, The Concept of Māyā. London, 1950.

G. Dumézil, Mitra Varuṇa. Essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la Souveraineté. Paris, 1948.

— Les dieux des Indo-Européens. Paris, 1952.

M. Falk, Nāmarūpa and Dharmarūpa. Calcutta, 1943.

J. N. Farquhar, Outline of the religious literature of India. Oxford, 1920.

K. F. Geldner, Vedische Studien. 3 Bde.

— Der Rigveda. Göttingen, 1923, vol. I.
— Der Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.), 1951, 3 vol.
H. von Glasenapp, Religionen Indiens. Stuttgart, 1943.
[illegible] Halle, 1940.
[illegible]
[illegible] –en, 1948.
[illegible]
[illegible] 947.
[illegible]
[illegible] W., 1893.
[illegible] d. 12.
[illegible] au 1927—1929.
E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Ir. Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1b. Strassburg, 1896.
— Gods and Saints of the great Brāhmaṇa, in: Transactions of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Science, vol. 15, 1909.
— Ethics of India. New Haven, 1924.
— The Religions of India. London, 1895.
H. Jacobi, Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern. Bonn, 1923.
[illegible]
[illegible] Wien, 1951.
[illegible] ndische Religie. Rede. Groningen, 1939.
Bh. Kumarappa, The Hindu conception of the deity. London, 1934.
H. Lüders, Varuna I. Göttingen, 1951.
A. A. Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, in: Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. Bd. 3. Heft 1a. Strassburg, 1896.
— Lectures on comparative Religion. London, 1925.
Nicol Macnicol, Indian Theism. London, 1919.
T. M. P. Mahadevan, The Philosophy of Advaita. London, 1938.
— Gauḍapāda. Madras, 1952.
L. S. S. O'Malley, Popular Hinduism. The religion of the masses. Cambridge, 1935.
J. MacKenzie, Hindu Ethics. London, 1922.
Majumdar, Raychauduri, Datta, An advanced History of India. London, 1950.
G. P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali proper names. London, 1938.

J. Masson, La Religion populaire dans le canon Bouddhique Pali. Leuven, 1942.
P. Masson-Oursel and H. de Willman-Grabowska, and *P. Stern*. Ancient India and Indian civilization. London, 1934.
J. J. Meyer, Sexual life in Ancient India. London, 2 vol., 1930.
— Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation. 3 Bde. Zürich, 1937.
M. Monier Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Oxford 1888.
J. Muir, Original Sanskrit texts. 5 vol. 1884.
M. Muusses, Koecultus bij de Hindoes. Utrecht, diss. 1922.
M. Müller, Varuṇa und Mitra, in: Contributions to the Science of Mythology. 2 (1897).
— The Upaniṣads. SBE, vol. 40. Oxford, 1926.
— Oorsprong en ontwikkeling van den Godsdienst, nagegaan in de godsdiensten van Indië, vert. A. H. Raabe. Utrecht, 1879.
H. Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda. Stuttgart, 1923.
— Die Lehre der Upaniṣaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus. Göttingen, 1923.
P. H. Pott, Yoga en Yantra en hunne betekenis voor de Indische Archaeologie. Leiden, 1946, diss.
S. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, 2 vol. London, 1948.
— The Bhagavad Gita. Text and translation. London, 1949.
L. Renou, La poésie religieuse de l'Indie antique. Paris, 1946.
— Bibliography Védique. Paris, 1931.
L. Renou et *E. Benveniste*, Vṛta et Vṛtragna. Cahiers de la société asiatique, III, Paris, 1931.
L. Renou et *J. Filliozat*, L'Inde Classique. Paris, 1947.
N. Stchoupak, L. Nitti, L. Renou, Dictionnaire sanskrit français. Paris, 1932.
St. *Rodhe*, Deliver us from evil. Lund. 1946, diss.
K. Rönnow, Trita Aptya. Upsala, 1927, diss.
W. Ruben, Die Philosophen der Upanisaden. Bern, 1947.
O. *Schrader (A. Nehring)*, Reallexikon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde. 2 Bde. Berlin, 1917—1929.
L. von Schroeder: Arische Religion. 2 Bde Leipzig, 1914—1916.
P. N. Srinivasachari, The Philosophy of the Visistadvaita. Adyar. 1946.
P. Thieme, Studien zur indogerm. Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte. Berlin, 1952.
B. A. G. Vroklage, Godsdiensten der Primitieven. Roermond, 1949.
A. Walde (J. Pokorny), Vergleichendes Wörterbuch des Indogerm. Sprachen. Berlin—Leipzig, 1930—1932.
H. Zimmer, Hindu Medicine. Baltimore 1948; Zürich, 1951.
— Myths and Symbols in Indian art and civilization. Washington D.C., 1947.

ABBREVIATIONS

Ait Br.: Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
AV.: Atharvaveda Saṃhitā.
BAU: Bṛhad āraṇyaka Upaniṣad.
Ch. Up.: Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
J. Br.: Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa (in Auswahl: Caland).
J. Up. Br.: Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa (Oertel).
P. Br.: Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa.
RV.: Rigveda Saṃhitā.
S. Br.: Satapatha Brāhmaṇa.
SBE.: Sacred Books of the East.